

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 11 }
WHOLE No. 505 }

DECEMBER 21, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—The troops of the Allied armies and of the United States practically completed during the week the occupation of the important bridgeheads of Cologne, *Military Movements*, Coblenz and Mainz. The Rhine is *Dec. 9, p.m.-Dec. 16, a.m.* now under their control. The English hold the bridgehead at Cologne, the Americans and the French those of Coblenz and Mainz respectively. The Belgians are in Aix-la-Chapelle. The armistice has been extended to the morning of January 17 of the coming year and the Allies have notified Germany that they reserve the right to occupy the neutral zone east of the Rhine from the Cologne bridgehead to the Dutch frontier. Marshal Foch announced, on behalf of Herbert C. Hoover, the American Food Administrator, that the tons of cargo space lying in German harbors must be placed under control of the Allies to supply Germany with foodstuffs. The ships are to remain German property.

The first voyage of an American President to Europe ended successfully on December 13. On that date the President landed from the United States steamship the *The President's Welcome in France* George Washington at Brest, in Brittany on the western coast of France. He was received with a demonstration of popular sympathy such as rarely, if ever, has been accorded to the Head of a foreign Government visiting France. After a brief but cordial address by the Mayor of Brest, the President left immediately for Paris. He arrived at the capital early on December 14, where the welcome given him outdid both in numbers present and in the intensity of the enthusiasm manifested, that which had been given him at Brest. In their affectionate greetings to the President it was evident that the French people were not only paying a personal tribute to him but were doing homage to the generosity, the services and the ideals of the United States. President Poincaré, Premier Clemenceau and other French officials, together with French and American military officers and prominent civilians, met Mr. Wilson's party at the railroad station. The day was declared a holiday in Paris. An official luncheon given by President and Mme. Poincaré in honor of President and Mrs. Wilson closed the official program of the day.

In his address of welcome to the American President,

President Poincaré said that Paris and France were eager to acclaim in him, "the illustrious Democrat whose words and whose deeds were inspired by exalted thought, the philosopher delighting in the solution of universal laws from particular events, the eminent statesman who found a way to express the highest political and moral truths in formulas which bear the stamp of immortality." Paris and France, moreover, added the French President, had a passionate desire to thank the great American Republic for its invaluable assistance. He paid a glowing tribute to American womanhood and to the troops of the American army. These troops brought with them "such a manly contempt of danger, such a smiling disregard for death, that our longer experience of this terrible war often moved us to counsel prudence." Promising that the French Government would submit to its honored guest documentary proofs from the German general staff with regard to the German program of pillage and industrial annihilation in Belgium and northern France, he urged punishment for the criminals and asked safeguards for the future. "Peace," he said, "must make amends for the sadness and misery of yesterday, and it must be a guarantee against the dangers of tomorrow." Speaking on this point, Mr. Poincaré added these words:

The association which has been formed for the purpose of war between the United States and the Allies, and which contains the seed of the permanent institutions of which you have spoken so eloquently, will find, from this day forward, a clear and profitable employment in the concerted search for equitable decisions, and in the mutual support which we need if we are to make our rights prevail.

In concluding, Mr. Poincaré offered to the President of the United States the thanks of France. France, he said, knows the friendship of America. She knows the rectitude and the elevation of mind of its President. It is in the fullest confidence that she is ready to work with him.

To these words President Wilson answered as follows:

Mr. President—I am deeply indebted to you for your gracious greeting. It is very delightful to find myself in France and to feel the quick contact of sympathy and unaffected friendship between the representatives of the United States and the representatives of France. You have been very

President Wilson's Reply

generous' in what you were pleased to say about myself, but I feel what I have said and what I have tried to do has been said and done only in an attempt to speak the thought of the people of the United States truly, and to carry that thought out in action.

From the first, the thought of the people of the United States turned toward something more than the mere winning of this war. It turned to the establishment of eternal principles of right and justice. It realized that merely to win the war was not enough; that it must be won in such a way and the questions raised by it settled in such a way as to insure the future peace of the world and lay the foundations for the freedom and happiness of its many peoples and nations.

Never before has war worn so terrible a visage or exhibited more grossly the debasing influence of illicit ambitions. I am sure that I shall look upon the ruin wrought by the armies of the Central Empires with the same revulsion and deep indignation that they stir in the hearts of the men of France and Belgium, and I appreciate as you do, sir, the necessity of such action in the final settlement of the issues of the war as will not only rebuke such acts of terror and spoliation, but make men everywhere aware that they cannot be ventured upon without the certainty of just punishment.

I know with what ardor and enthusiasm the soldiers and sailors of the United States have given the best that was in them to this war of redemption. They have expressed the true spirit of America. They believe their ideals to be acceptable to free peoples everywhere, and are rejoiced to have played the part they have played in giving reality to those ideals in co-operation with the armies of the Allies. We are proud of the part they have played, and we are happy that they should have been associated with such comrades in a common cause.

It is with peculiar feeling, Mr. President, that I find myself in France joining with you in rejoicing over the victory that has been won. The ties that bind France and the United States are peculiarly close. I do not know in what other comradeship we could have fought with more zest or enthusiasm. It will daily be a matter of pleasure with me to be brought into consultation with the statesmen of France and her Allies in concerting the measures by which we may secure permanence for these happy relations of friendship and cooperation, and secure for the world at large such safety and freedom in its life as can be secured only by the constant association and cooperation of friends. I greet you, not only with deep personal respect, but as the representative of the great people of France, and beg to bring you the greetings of another great people to whom the fortunes of France are of profound and lasting interest. I raise my glass to the health of the President of the French Republic and to Mme. Poincaré and the prosperity of France.

To an address made to him by the French Socialists, the President in reply said:

The war through which we have just passed has frustrated in a way which never can be forgotten the *President Wilson and the Socialists* extraordinary wrongs which can be perpetrated by arbitrary and irresponsible power. It is not possible to secure the happiness and prosperity of the world, to establish an enduring peace, unless the repetition of such wrongs is rendered impossible. This has indeed been a peoples' war. It has been waged against absolutism and militarism, and these enemies of liberty must from this time forth be shut out from the possibility of working their cruel will upon mankind.

In my judgment, it is not sufficient to establish this principle. It is necessary that it should be supported by a cooperation of the nations which shall be based upon fixed and definite covenants, and which shall be made certain of effective action through the instrumentality of a league of nations. I believe this to be the

conviction of all thoughtful and liberal men. I am confident that this is the thought of those who lead your own great nation, and I am looking forward with peculiar pleasure to cooperating with them in securing guarantees of a lasting peace of justice and right dealing which shall justify the sacrifices of this war and cause men to look back upon those sacrifices as the dramatic and final processes of their emancipation.

On December 15 the President laid a wreath on the tomb of Lafayette, and had conferences with Premier Clemenceau, Colonel House and Herbert C. Hoover. While the President of the United States was being enthusiastically welcomed in the French capital, Dr. Sidonio Paes, President of the Portuguese Republic, was shot at and killed by an assassin in Lisbon. Dr. Paes became Provisional President Dec. 9, 1917, after a three days' revolution against the Castro Government.

Chili.—For the past three weeks or more a boundary dispute that threatens to be serious has been going on between Chili and Peru. According to the treaty of Anca,

Serious Boundary Dispute

signed October 20, 1883, which ended a fierce boundary war that had raged for four years, the provinces of Tacna and Arica, rich in nitrates, were to stay in Chili's possession for ten years. At the expiration of that period the provinces were to remain with Chili or be ceded to Peru according to the results of a plebiscite by the inhabitants of the two provinces, \$10,000,000 being paid to the country losing the territory. Ever since 1893, there have been disputes between the two nations about the way of carrying out the plebiscite, and meanwhile Chili retained the two provinces.

Now the Peruvians insist upon the question being settled and complain of attacks made in Chili on Peruvian Consuls and residents. Chili, it is said, is averse to having the plebiscite, fearing it will go against her and thus cause her to lose two provinces in which her capital is heavily invested.

Argentina and the United States volunteered to be mediators between the disputants. On December 14 the announcement was made that informal answers had been received, Peru indicating a wish that the good offices of the United States might be employed to bring about a settlement, and the Chilean Government contenting itself with expressing appreciation of the spirit of the offer. Meanwhile rioting and bloodshed appear to be going on still in Chili and Peru. The latter country's army reserves have been called to the colors and two divisions of the Chilean army have been mobilized.

France.—The pact entered into by France, Great Britain and Russia in the spring of 1916, which had to do with the partition of Asiatic Turkey, and which was

Partition of Syria

first published by the Maximalist organ, *La Pravda*, when the Bolshevik Government gave it to the public along with other diplomatic documents, is now being subjected to considerable criticism, for the most part

unfavorable, in France at least. *Etudes*, *Les Nouvelles Religieuses*, *Europe Nouvelle*, have all taken up the subject and have devoted articles of considerable length to its discussion. The fall of the Russian monarchy, while eliminating one party to the agreement, has not, apparently, disturbed the understanding between France and Great Britain, for these two Governments have recently made a common declaration to the effect, that they are resolved to aid the peoples who have been freed from the Ottoman yoke towards the establishment of their own governments, along lines selected on their own initiative. The main lines of the agreement are as follows:

Russia acquires the provinces of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, Bitlis, and the territories of southern Kurdistan following the line of the Moucha-Sert-Ihn-Omar-Amalia Persian frontier. France receives the strip of Syria along the coast, the vilayet of Adana and a territory bounded on the south by the Aintab-Kharput line to the Russian frontier and on the north by a line drawn through Ala-Dagh-Kessaria-Ak-Ladgo-Vildiz-Dagh-Zara-Oguine-Kharput. Great Britain acquires the southern portion of Mesopotamia with Bagdad and reserves to itself the ports of Akka and Haifa.

According to the agreement between France and Great Britain the zone between the French and British regions will constitute the confederation of Arabian States or an independent Arabian State. Alexandretta is declared an open port.

With the general knowledge of the pact, dissatisfaction on the part of the French is growing. In spite of the declaration made by the official representatives of France and Great Britain to the Central Syrian Committee during the month of December, 1917, and repeated a few days later by M. Stephen Pichon, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the Chamber of Deputies, that France would have the rôle of first importance in assisting the new republic, the impression is growing that France is being ousted from her place of prime influence in the affairs of Asia Minor. M. Georges Samné, in *Europe Nouvelle*, does not hesitate to say that "the concession [made by the pact to France] is practically equivalent to an eviction." M. Charles Albert, writing in the *Etudes*, arrives at pretty much the same conclusion. *Les Nouvelles Religieuses* quotes the appeal of the Assembly of the Presidents of the Chambers of Commerce of France against the restrictions of French influence in the Levant, and the letter, on the same subject, of his Eminence Cardinal Maurin, Archbishop of Lyons, the same review, also reproduces from *Le Journal des Débats*, the appeal of the French Colonial League and the account of the formation of Lyons Committee of French interests in Syria, both in the same sense.

The *Etudes* goes into considerable detail to show that the proposed pact, aside from the fact that it minimizes the traditional position of French influence in the Levant and has sinister connotations for French African possessions, is an injustice to Syria. Syria, historically and geographically, extends from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates. The pact, however, dismembers Syria, deprives it of its sea coast, deprives it of its ports, which

as an agricultural land are essential to its prosperity, deprives it of its richest provinces, Aleppo and Damascus, which are transferred to Arabia, and in general bears a very marked resemblance to the reprobated partition of Poland. As a consequence the more far-seeing thinkers of France are demanding a revision of the agreement in accord with the just aspirations of the people, based on the justice and equity of which today there is so much talk, and better adapted to maintain the traditional exercise of French influence in the East.

Germany.—Political conditions remain unchanged. Chaos still reigns among the various Socialist elements struggling for supremacy. A small group of extreme

Political and Economic Confusion

radicals is terrorizing the feeble Socialist Government. The resignation of Foreign Minister, Dr. Solf, demanded by the Independent and Spartacus groups, and freely tendered by him, has not yet been accepted by the majority Socialists, since virtually all the trained officials of the Foreign Office were determined to resign with him. Economically the same confusion exists, particularly in Berlin. According to a cable to the *New York Times*, numerous workers have left their places of employment, and are insisting upon higher wages or the so called famine subsidy. Thus the Wertheim employees demand lump sums from 100 to 500 marks as compensation for the extra expenses due to the ever-increasing prices of clothes. Another company, whose wages were not cut when the eight-hour law went into effect, declares that the various demands made upon it since then would mean an increase in the payroll of 54,000,000 marks, while its annual dividends amount to only 13,500,000 marks. Thousands of workers adopted a passive resistance, appearing every day and drawing their weekly wages, but accomplishing nothing. At the Schwartzkopf works, where the Spartacus group is in power, the various councils voted to the workers an extra increase of wages amounting to 25,000,000 marks, the exact sum ready in bank for distribution among the company's shareholders. The workers claim that they have earned this money and that the shareholders have no right to it. In a procession formed by them, red banners were carried with the inscription: "Spartacus Company, formerly Schwartzkopf & Co." In the mean time a commission has been at work drafting a new national constitution, which is said to have been modeled on the American and English charters, but provides for an executive who will be more restricted in authority than the President of the United States. The upper chamber is to be made up of delegates from the federated States, while the lower house will be composed of general and popular representatives. The referendum is provided for and universal, direct, equal and secret suffrage.

Great Britain.—On December 14 nearly 21,000,000 men and women had the opportunity of taking part in

the Parliamentary elections which were conducted under many new conditions. For the first time in the country's history the suffrage was accorded to every adult male and to women over thirty years of age. A further new feature was that, instead of prolonging the elections over several weeks, all were held on the same day. Election expenses were legally restricted, and the members of the coming Parliament will be paid for their services. Fourteen women were put in nomination, among them Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington, Miss Christobel Pankhurst, and the Countess Georgianna Markievicz, the Dublin Sinn Fein leader. No results have been announced as the ballots are not to be counted before December 28, but it seems highly probable that the present Government will be sustained. Of 706 members to be returned, no opposition was offered to 104. Among these were twenty-two Sinn Feiners.

In a recent address the former Foreign Secretary, Viscount Grey, while expressing his hope for the formation of a world league, referred to "the freedom of the seas" as a matter "which, if not properly understood, might create difficulties between President Wilson and the British Government." There could be no disagreement regarding a freedom of the seas in time of peace, for that had always been maintained wherever the British navy was able to exercise its power. Freedom of the seas in time of war could not be understood by the United States to exclude "the complete blockade of an offending nation," since the United States had actively and efficiently cooperated with Great Britain in doing that very thing in the late war. The question involved the erection of a league. There was no reason why Great Britain should not accept and guarantee a freedom of the seas which meant "complete freedom as long as the covenants of the League were observed, but in case these are broken, every force is to be used against the violator."

Rome.—True to their avowed purpose, the radicals of Italy took occasion of the Italian victory over Austria to declare that the Pope was chagrined over the event. The Holy Father has found it advisable to put his real sentiments on record. Accordingly he wrote to Cardinal Gasparri on November 3, 1918.

After the late happy success of the Italian armies, the enemies of the Holy See, persevering in their design of making capital against it out of every event, whether sad or joyous, tried, and are still trying, to use the joy of the Italian people over their triumph as a means of stirring up public opinion against the Pope, as if the Sovereign Pontiff did not share in the common sentiment and was annoyed at the victory.

You, my dear Cardinal, are well aware of Our sentiments, for you have been a constant witness of them, and you also know what is the Church's practice and doctrine in such circumstances. In Our letter of August 1, 1917, which was addressed to the Heads of the belligerent Powers, We expressed the wish, and

We have given expression to the same wish on other occasions, that the territorial questions which concern Austria and Italy should receive a solution conformable to the just aspirations of the peoples. Recently We gave instructions to the Nuncio, at Vienna, to establish amicable relations with the different nationalities of the Austrian Empire which are now set up as independent States.

Being a perfect society with the sole purpose of sanctifying souls at all times and among all peoples, the Church adapts itself to different forms of government and acquiesces without difficulty in legitimate changes, whether political or territorial, which occur among peoples. Were Our policy and views on this matter more generally known, We believe that no sensible person would continue to credit Us with a regret which is quite without foundation.

For the rest, We cannot deny that a shadow still troubles the serenity of Our soul, because hostilities have not altogether ceased; and the clash of arms, which resounds in many places, gives Us cause for preoccupation and fear. However, in the hope that the dawn of peace, which has shone over our beloved land, will not be long in bringing joy to other belligerent peoples as well, we are already tasting the sweetness of the day, now not distant, when charity will reign anew and universal concord will unite the nations in a league rich in possibilities for good.

The letter ends with an expression of especial good-will towards his Eminence, the Cardinal Secretary of State.

On the same day that this protest of the Holy Father was written, Cardinal Amette, Archbishop of Paris, published in the *Semaine Religieuse de Paris* a similar protest against the Pope's calumniators in France:

A review [*Revue de Paris*] edited at Paris and read by a large number of persons, published in its issues of October 15 and November 1, two unsigned articles under the title, "The Politics of Benedict XV." These articles contained unjust and offensive attacks on the Sovereign Pontiff. As Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church and Pastor of this diocese of Paris, it is my duty to enter a protest against these attacks and to put the Faithful on guard against the spirit by which they are animated.

The author, who hides under the veil of anonymity, makes profession of being a Catholic: no one has the right to call himself a Catholic who treats the Head of the Church in such a way. There is no need of refuting in detail the unfounded accusations, the unjust insinuations, the false and malevolent interpretations with which the articles in question are filled; but we do declare once again, with full knowledge and deliberation, that Benedict XV, throughout the course of the war, has not only not taken sides against France and her Allies, but has multiplied the proofs of his good-will towards our country, and has never wished or asked for anything but a peace "conformable to justice and the legitimate aspirations of peoples."

Les Nouvelles Religieuses, from which Cardinal Amette's letter is reproduced, concludes a long and detailed refutation of the attacks on the Holy Father with the very just remark that anticlericalism is failing in its duty to France by sowing discord among the citizens, that it could much better employ its force by trying to stem, instead of aiding, the wave of anarchy which is sweeping over Europe, that the principles of the *union sacrée* which have given France its power during the war, should be maintained in their vigor in order to prevent religious and social disorder, and that at the base of national French life should be placed respect for all rights, including those of the Church and the Pope.

The Book the Kings Forgot

J. C. WALSH

TWO years after the war started, Mr. H. G. Wells confessed that he had forgotten Bloch. The admission was hardly deserving of credence. Wells, with his passion for foreseeing, could not have forgotten Bloch, but to disremember him was doubtless convenient during the early war period when all the writers were demonstrating that victory on the field was an affair of the week after next, or, at farthest, the month after next. After two years Mr. Wells was ready to concede the realization of Bloch's prediction that "War, between great powers, will become a kind of stalemate, in which, neither army being able to get at the other, both armies will be maintained in opposition to each other, but never being able to deliver a final and decisive attack." By 1916, when Mr. Wells was in the confessing mood, or a little later, another phase of the prediction had come true; "Instead of a war fought out to the bitter end in a series of decisive battles, we shall have as a substitute a long period of continually increasing strain upon the resources of the combatants." Bloch maintained that "war has become impossible alike from a military, economic and political point of view," and when W. T. Stead went to St. Petersburg, as long ago as 1899, to ask him what he meant by such a statement, he added that:

If any attempt were made to demonstrate the inaccuracy of my assertions by putting the matter to a test on a great scale, we should find the inevitable result in a catastrophe which would destroy all existing political organizations. The great war cannot be made, and any attempt to make it would result in suicide.

Well, the Kings, and the Powers behind them, made the great war, and President Wilson just the other day told Congress of his apprehension lest the verdict of suicide, already rendered as accounting for the destruction of all previously existing political organizations in Russia, Austria and Germany might also have to be registered against France and England before very long.

Ivan S. Bloch was a Polish banker, with a taste for economics. How his mind got running on war does not appear, but possibly it was that in thinking about Poland he realized the existence of a limitation upon the ability of a nation to make war. "War has become impossible for the minor States," he said. "Impossible," conceded Stead, "that is to say, without the leave and license of the great Powers."

As impossible [returned Bloch], for Belgium or Denmark to make war today as it would be for you or me to assert the right of private war, which our forefathers possessed. We could only try to do it and then be summarily suppressed and punished for our temerity.

This reasoning doubtless suggested an inquiry as to how big a country had to be before it could make war, and after reading what the greatest contemporary authorities in all countries were writing about warfare and

the weapons of offense and defense, he came to the conclusion that the great Powers were no better off than the lesser, for the great Powers were seen to be watching each other so closely, were so keen upon maintaining a balance of power, that war between them would be

simply the natural evolution of the armed peace, on an aggravated scale, and would of necessity be accompanied by entire dislocation of all industry and severing of all sources of supply, by which alone the community is enabled to bear the crushing burden of that armed peace. It will be a multiplication of expenditure simultaneously accompanied by a diminution of the resources by which that expenditure can be met. That is the future of war, not fighting but famine, not the slaying of men but the bankruptcy of nations and the break-up of the whole social organization.

Twenty years ago and more the Polish banker thought this was susceptible of conclusive demonstration, and he supplied the materials for the demonstration. He foresaw, and had the highest military authority for believing, that the next war would be a long war; that it would take the form of a series of siege operations; that the army temporarily beaten would be able, because of the immense numbers involved, to retire to new positions and there establish itself; that at any moment there might be an exchange of rôles, the defense being almost certain to revert to the attack; and that behind the lines agriculture, industry, commerce and finance would proceed toward exhaustion with a rapidity in direct ratio to the size of the armies that have to be maintained and supported; finally, famine and revolution would be ushered in. He foresaw that the armies would stand up to each other indefinitely until the crash came to the civil population, that the decision would not depend upon the fighting men, but upon "the quality of toughness or capacity for endurance, of patience under privation, of stubbornness under reverses and disappointment." "Your soldiers may fight as they please; the ultimate decision is in the hands of famine."

How long [he asked], do you think your social fabric will remain stable under such circumstances? Believe me, the more the ultimate political and social consequences of the modern war are calmly contemplated, the more clearly will it be evident that if war is possible it is possible only at the price of suicide. The day when the nations could hope to settle their disputes by appealing to the arbitrament of war is gone by, first, because no definite decision can speedily be secured, and, second, the costs of the process are ruinous to both the suitors.

This philosophical banker, who had made military science and social economics his twin hobbies, who had drawn his deductions and formed his opinions, but who still had not too much confidence in the wisdom of the rulers of men concluded as follows:

No doubt the nations may endeavor to prove that I am wrong, but you will see what will happen. I do not for a moment deny that it is possible for the nations to plunge themselves and their neighbors into a frightful series of catastrophes which would

probably result in the overturn of all civilized and orderly government. That is possible. What is not possible is any war that will not entail, even upon the victorious power, the destruction of its resources and the break-up of society. War has become impossible except at the price of suicide.

Twenty years ago, then, Mr. Bloch aimed to show kings and emperors that they would do well to find, and find quickly, some better method than the armed peace, to which they all were party and which was so wasteful as to be threatening them with hunger and even anarchy, else they would presently have desperate recourse to war, which would be far worse. He pointed out that they had better concede in time the limitation of the war-making power as it applied to themselves, just as they enforced the limitation against all the minor Powers. The Kings and the Emperors read the book and they thought pretty well of it. So did their military advisers. But they could not accomplish the combination of wisdom necessary to devise and adopt something better than the armed peace. They went to the Hague to try, but they did not try altogether honestly, not all of them. The world laughed at them openly, and in secret they laughed at one another. Perhaps the Czar was the most honest of all. He may have believed in Bloch. Certainly he was the first to have the proof made upon his throne and upon his person of the soundness of the arguments put forward by his little Polish subject. He has not been alone. Europe is republican today from the Atlantic to the Urals, Red republican most of the way, and there is amply justified apprehension that the red flag may presently fly over the countries it does not already cover. The demonstration of the theory that war involves the mutual suicide of the participants has

been thorough enough. Nobody has any taste for further proof.

The question would seem to be, would it not, whether the demonstration in fact shall be treated as slightly now as the demonstration in theory was twenty years ago. Will the new Europe be one on which, to maintain its stability, the great Powers must immediately revert to the now thoroughly discredited policy of the armed peace? **If there are to be many minor Powers** with unscientific boundaries and armies, whence is to come their protection, and how and by whom will they be constrained to keep the peace? Before it is settled that the freedom of little peoples to live their own lives is no longer dependent upon the favor of the great Powers; securities will have to be exacted for the good behavior of the great Powers. And these will have to be secured against each other, since neither numbers nor wealth nor power avail to make them truly independent. Will a serious effort now be made, in the presence of this tragedy, to establish an equality of great and small, of strong and weak, before the law, and to provide for the setting up of a police power capable of enforcing the law? If not, then it would seem the slaughter and the waste have been in vain. If not, then too, what is the outlook for the small nationalities now being set up in business for themselves, all of them minor Powers incapable of providing for their own military security? The commandment, "Thou shalt not make war" would represent the collective aspiration of men. But has saddened and stricken humanity at its service the wisdom necessary to ensure that the commandment shall be honored and observed?

Views on Our Government

J. W. DAWSON

THIS is a day of transitions among governments. The enormous pressure of war and its attendant economic, political and social influence has been so great that it has brought about the downfall of the most secure dynasties, substituted anarchy for autocracy and modified into strongly centralized governments the most liberal democracies.

Peace has come, but to a world vastly different from the world that existed in 1914. What the war has done to Russia, to Turkey, to Austria and to Germany is apparent because the effects have been so radical. The tides of revolution are swirling high in those lands, engulfing everything. Three thousand miles away, we look with critical eye on those changes, speculate as to their outcome and stand ready to help, if necessary, in the re-establishment of order. But have we, the people of the United States, been immune from those influences operating since 1914? Can we say that our Government has been free from the effect of forces that have contaminated and destroyed elsewhere? Are we

the nation we were before our entry into the war?

At this hour of victory it is fitting and proper that we stop for a moment and ask ourselves the momentous question: *Quo vadis?* It is most idle to presume that the war has not affected our institutions. No one can say that when the waves recede they will not have etched a new surface, eating away here, building up there, but in every place leaving things different from what they found them. It would be impossible to have the tremendous influences to which our nation has been subjected for the past year working on the very soul of the people without leaving some mark, some tendencies, born of new habits, for good or evil. Are we loath to admit them because they have been imperceptible in their growth or gradual in their extension?

After the completion of the Croton dam, the supervising engineer led a party of visitors on a tour of inspection. They marveled at the great height, at the massiveness of the dam. When he heard their remarks, the engineer smiled. "You forget the most important part

of the whole thing. This dam is as deep as it is high. You measure it only by its visible aspects."

Is it necessary to show some monumental change, some physical modification to prove that our Government is not what it was; that it is being molded along new lines by strong and constant reactions; that it is no longer the Government of Washington or Jefferson or even Lincoln? A republic is a living, changing entity, susceptible to the most subtle influences. *Tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis*; so too with governments, for governments are made up of men.

We are erecting our Croton dam. Its outlines may still be shadowy and indefinite but it is there, nevertheless, looming large in its proportions. And the structure is not the work of today. We began our foundation before the Civil War and the work has gone on steadily though gradually ever since.

Go back to the days preceding 1861. Examine the great questions facing the people in those days. They were trying to work out the problem of a strongly centralized Government or a Federal Government limited and circumscribed by States with sovereign powers. Look into the cases then before the United States Supreme Court and ask yourself if they present a debatable matter to you. In *Chisholm vs. Georgia* the question was whether a citizen of one State could sue another State in the Federal Court. In the *Marbury* case the principle involved was whether the Supreme Court could review the acts of the legislature. In *McCullough vs. Maryland* the problem was whether a State had the right to lay a tax upon an institution chartered by Congress. In *Gibbons vs. Ogden* the question was whether a State had the exclusive right to the navigable waters of the State. Would you hesitate a moment in giving your answer to these questions? To the mind of today, with our conception of government, these cases, so momentous then, present principles of such an elementary and apparent nature as not to deserve any discussion.

At that time the idea was strongly advanced that the State was a natural and necessary unit, possessing sovereign powers which were to be preserved at any cost if the republic were to endure. Any growth of the Federal power, any diminution of the individual State's rights was feared as dangerous. The American consciousness still remembered vividly the pre-Revolutionary days and the tyrannies of an unchecked Government.

However, under the firm and, at that time, bold direction of Chief Justice Marshall strong influences were set to work to change and alter this widespread feeling. He laid the foundation of the structure that was to rise to its present great proportions. He brought about the birth of the new nationalism that foreshadowed and made inevitable the fierce struggle of the Civil War.

That conflict did more than decide the question of States-rights. During the strife, because of wartime necessity, Lincoln took upon himself great powers, powers never before exercised under the Constitution.

His act in freeing the slaves was wholly unconstitutional. His suspension of the writ of *Habeas Corpus* was contrary to law. His administration was undoubtedly that of an autocrat. It is true, as Viscount Bryce points out in "The American Commonwealth," that the wartime powers of the President subsided in time of peace, but not without creating a new national mind, and establishing a modified national consciousness. Thus while the Civil War decided the question of States-rights, it also made easy the enactment of the long series of Federal laws that mark the tremendous growth of national power. It was the dominant factor in determining the people's mind toward new questions of governmental policy. It marked the dawn of a new era.

This era was the era of nationalism. Subconsciously but surely the nation's attitude toward the great problems facing it changed and swung on new axes. The question of States-rights became subordinated to a new consideration. The controlling clause in the Constitution that held attention was no longer the Tenth Amendment that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." The new consideration lay in Section 8, Art. 1: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." Necessity and not States-rights became the new determining factor. The principle underlying the new era was one of expediency. Every act of Congress was examined under this new light, the light of paramount necessity. A cursory examination of the decisions of the Supreme Court since the Civil War contrasted with its decisions before 1861 shows the growth of this new national consciousness. It was the doctrine of paramount necessity which determined the constitutionality of the tax on State banks in 1864, the suppression in 1890 of the lottery traffic through the control of national and interstate commerce, the passage of the quarantine laws in 1899; the establishment of the first Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887; the Food and Drugs act in 1906; the Sherman Anti-Trust act in 1890; the Clayton act in 1914; the Federal Trade Commission act in 1914; the creation of a Board of Mediation and Conciliation in 1913; and the Government control of railroads, telephones and telegraphs in 1918.

What did these various acts do or attempt to do? In every instance they contained grants expanding and enlarging the Federal power, establishing Federal regulation and setting up controlling agencies to work out the national will regarding matters held formerly to be purely within the supervision of the separate States. It expanded the national police power in direct ratio to the diminution of the State police power.

This growth in the expansion of Federalism was gradual and somewhat imperceptible up to the entry of the

United States into the war. Here the mild necessity of peace times gave way to the tremendous pressure of the needs of war. Having attained the new national consciousness of Federal control we willingly placed extra-constitutional and most arbitrary powers in the hands of the President and his appointees. To win the war, the people of this Republic willingly became the subjects of an autocratic Government that controlled absolutely our food, fuel and labor. It regulated prices, dictated what business could be done, placed a price on labor and laid down the command that a man could not strike or even be idle. In a land where the Government was founded upon the principle that he is best governed who is least governed, Federal power was so expanded as to control everything. The Government told the people when to get up, what to eat, when they could and could not work, what they could work at, how they could travel, what they might manufacture and what they could say. A gigantic, all-powerful instrument was put into operation, reaching far in its extension and deep in its application. It was like the great superstructure of the dam, slow in its fundamental growth from the days of 1861 but now tremendous in its proportions.

No one can quarrel with the facts. It is in their interpretation that men differ. No American questioned the right of his Government to do everything humanly possible to end the war successfully and speedily. No sacrifice was too great, no hardship too severe, if they contributed to the support of those magnificent armies of American boys who went into battle solely to see the triumph of their unselfish ideals.

We cannot and do not criticize the work of the American Government during the war. The results attained were so marvelous, so stupendous as to challenge the admiration of the whole world. But these changes born of necessity did more than prove facile instruments for the successful prosecution of the war. In their operation they were reacting tremendously upon the national consciousness, molding and shaping it along strongly marked lines. Since 1861 the national mind has been made fertile for the sowing of the seed of nationalism. Under the plea of the necessity of Federal regulation the American people were slowly being educated to a strong, dominant central Government. Today after the war and with the apparent success of Federal control and regulation before them, they are accepting as beneficial the widest control and supervision. The seed is now full-grown fruit. The trend towards an all-controlling central Government is no longer a tendency. It is now an accepted fact. Federal power has solved the war problems successfully and in so doing has made the American mind less distrustful of centralized power and autocratic rule. Having seen its operation in war, they will be more ready to have it remain powerful in peace. Our Government is no longer the government of Washington, Jefferson or Lincoln. Each successive modification has so influenced the minds of the people as to make

easy further changes more radical, until today because of this psychological inoculation the people have been predisposed to the new conditions in the body politic.

These are the facts. When we review them at such a time as this when our Government is going through a period of critical reconstruction, it might be salutary to ask ourselves frank questions and to expect frank replies. Have these changes since the days of 1861 been good? Or are they the children of expediency, with inherent potentialities for evil? Have we been viewing our problems in terms of days rather than years? The path we have followed is easily traceable *backwards*, but who can tell whither it runs? The nation is moving with tremendous strides. *Quo vadit?*

When we consider that one State now suffers from the negligence or carelessness or low standards of another, when we realize that the telephone, the telegraph, and the improved means of transportation have made the old division of States a mere geographical arbitrary unit, we must conclude that the expansion of the Federal police power has been necessary and salutary. Dr. Ryan, in his article in the *Catholic World* for November on the Supreme Court and Child Labor, is correct when he writes:

State autocracy is not an end in itself; it is only a means to public welfare. It promotes its end when it functions wisely in regard to matters which concern only the people within the boundaries of the individual State. When the matter to be regulated is one which affects persons without as well as within the State, exclusive control of it by the State is undemocratic and contrary to public welfare. It amounts to government of the people of one State by the people of another State.

In principle we would not quarrel with such reasoning. But why should we, in our enthusiasm for abstract principles, hide from ourselves the less pleasant actualities? The benefits resulting from a highly centralized Federal government are very great. It would seem that Federal regulation and control provide the easiest means of meeting interstate problems. But is our norm simply to be that of expediency? Is it not true that there are also attending dangers of vast potentiality? Are we willing to cure an evil by creating a greater one? Are we willing to keep our eyes too close to the road and not to its direction and destination?

If the Federal Government in principle and fact is to regulate and control our commerce, our business relations, our labor, our railroads, our food, our fuel, our education, and our health, Congress must create and call into existence the necessary means to carry its mandates into effect. The next consideration is tremendous in its importance. To whom shall Congress give the power essential for the successful execution of its delegated authority? It cannot act itself. It must create the necessary agencies and clothe them with powers proportionate to the work to be done. If they are to function properly they must be endowed with authority to act and to compel obedience to their orders. Regulation and control necessarily include in their terms concrete, physical agents,

greater and more powerful than the objects to be regulated and controlled.

Therein lies the danger. During the past fifty years that have marked the growth of Federal power, Congress acting on the theory of paramount necessity has widely extended the principles of Federal control. It has been most liberal in giving plenary powers for the execution of its mandates. As it assumed greater and greater control over conditions formerly regulated by the individual States it ordained and established new agencies proportionate in number and authority. As a direct result there has sprung up a bureaucratic fungus which startles the observer by its growth.

This growth is outlined by Commissioner West in his splendid work "Federal Power." In 1894 the Division of Botany cost \$8,600 per annum. Within twenty years this appropriation has grown to \$2,000,000. The cost of the Bureau of Forestry has increased from \$7,280 to more than \$5,000,000. The Bureau of Chemistry now costs over \$1,000,000 a year. The Federal Government pays over \$1,000,000 annually to inspect meat. It takes it upon itself to instruct the farmer in the care of his crops, in the raising of his cattle, and goes so far as to tell his wife how to cook. The Bureau of Standards has grown from four employees to a point where it costs \$1,000,000 a year. We are told that the Federal Government paid out in a single year \$400,000 for the sole purpose of eradicating the cattle tick.

The Post-Office costs \$45,000,000. Commissioner West tells us that many new departments have been created, including the Department of Labor, while a Department of Health is being advocated. There have been a multitude of bureaus established, the Bureau of Corporations, the Bureau of Light Houses, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Bureau of Fisheries, the Bureau of Navigation, and the Bureau of Mines. These are all exclusive of the bureaus established during the last year for the successful prosecution of the war.

A few months ago Senator Hoke Smith introduced a bill for the establishment of a Federal Bureau of Education, the cost of which will run into millions of dollars. We now have a Federal Board of Vocational Education, which spends \$6,000,000 annually. The Commissioner of Education has just asked for \$22,000,000 a year to provide for physical education.

Improvement of our waterways by the Federal authorities has resulted in the expenditure of such extravagant sums during so many years that we now look upon the "pork barrel" as one of our established institutions.

These bureaus are of pre-war growth. Is it necessary to point out their great expansion and increase in numbers and authority since our entry into the war? It is too early yet to know what the control of railroads will cost us or the number of bureaus made necessary by taking them over. We have not yet been told of the cost of the countless bureaus established for the control of food, for the regulation of business, commerce, manufacture,

publicity and fuel. All these are outside of purely military agencies. It is not necessary to point out the autocratic powers possessed and exercised by these administrative agencies. There is not a single individual, corporate or personal, producer or consumer, capitalist or laborer, who has not felt the inhibiting circumscribing dictates of the Federal Government. We have submitted to them for two reasons, first because in the last fifty years our conception of our Government has changed, due to the shifting basis of national consciousness and secondly because as a people we were idealistic and, above all, patriotic. What will be the results of the war? They must be considered in two lights. Subjectively we as members of the nation shall have been taught a stronger lesson in Government control. We shall have seen the necessity of Government supervision, and having seen shall be more ready to accept further and still further control and regulation by those in authority, for in times of peace, we shall still have before us the beneficent results of autocratic, centralized authority without which we could not have waged war successfully. The national mind, having seen the operation of these wartime instruments, will be more ready for the sowing of propaganda that these same Federal instruments be used to solve the problems of peace. Objectively considered, those agencies and the persons who made up them once having enjoyed their power will be loathe to relinquish it. Power is sweet, and once assumed is rarely given up. It is not merely a gift; it creates in the trustee a psychological reaction that the trust is a personal attribute and therefore necessary.

The result has been that instead of a republic where individualism was one of the underlying principles we are already to a marked degree and will continue to become a bureaucratic oligarchy. A nation such as conceived by the framers of our Constitution, to exist must have a government of checks and balances, and when we destroy, as we have willingly done, those safeguards which tend to check too great a centralization of power, when we have laid aside our Constitution and made possible the assumption of power uncontrolled, even though as yet unabused, we are sowing seeds, the fruit of which our children may not care to reap.

In a republic decentralized and with many checks and balances the danger from Socialism is slight, but as we are going now we are making possible the growth of bureaucratic paternalism, which must lead us eventually into either a purely Socialistic State or an absolute autocracy. There can be no other outcome.

The hour in our history has come when we cannot be unmindful of the needs of the masses. We must have enacted into law remedies for our social evils. The Federal arm is long and we have strengthened it to work our will. But we must be fearful of creating another Frankenstein. We are no longer an essentially constitutional government. We are becoming more and more paternalistic, a condition not far removed from Socialism.

We have witnessed and allowed the growth of an imperialistic machine which may in some future day, prove the vehicle for some man's ambition. The eyes of the citizen, whether merchant, manufacturer, trader or laborer must now turn for sanction for everything to Washington and the bureaus there. Our State Governments and legislatures have become useless appendages. The elements are all present for the establishment of a permanent autocracy, based upon a Socialistic bureau-

racy. In a recent address Robert Lansing said:

The period of readjustment and restoration which will follow the disorganization and destruction caused by the war will tax human wisdom to the uttermost. . . . Many of the fundamental principles of the present social order will be threatened; some will be changed, some discarded, while novel and possibly extravagant and dangerous doctrines will find earnest and honest advocates. With all this we must reckon.

In this perilous hour where shall we stand? *Tibi seris, tibi metis*: As you sow, you reap.

The Pope and Civil Prisoners

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

THE Hague Agreement, universally accepted on October 18, 1907, laid down a number of humane provisions for the treatment of civil populations brought by the hazards of war under the domination of an enemy Power. It did not, however, cover the case of those civilians, who, for one reason or another, might be arrested, deported or interned. The effects of this lack of foresight soon made themselves felt. Almost immediately after the outbreak of hostilities, internment-camps, destined for non-combatants, sprang into existence, and military requirements soon gave rise to the new classification of civil prisoners of war. These victims of circumstances were necessarily subjected to many sufferings, and before long enlisted the profound sympathy of the Holy Father. Emboldened by his success in negotiating the exchange of military prisoners, incapacitated by wounds or disease from further service, Pope Benedict XV determined to intercede with the belligerents in behalf of civil prisoners.*

The first diplomatic action was taken by him on January 11, 1915, when he sent, through the Cardinal Secretary of State, an official note to the Ambassador of Austria-Hungary at the Vatican, and to the Ministers accredited to the Holy See by Bavaria, Belgium, Germany, Great Britain, and Russia. Though neither Serbia nor Turkey had any official representative at the Papal court, yet means were taken to get into communication with both these Governments, and moreover, Great Britain was asked to bring the matter to the attention of France.

In this note the Holy See, after thanking the various Governments for their kind reception of the former Vatican proposal in behalf of military prisoners, suggested to the Sovereigns and Heads of the belligerent nations that they should also agree to an exchange of civil prisoners of the following classes: All women and girls; boys and young men under seventeen years of age; male adults over the age of fifty-five; male adults under the age of fifty-five, who were physicians, surgeons, ministers of religion, or were recognized, on account of disease or other reasons, to be unfit for military service.

The first answer from the Central Powers to the note of the Holy See was given in the letter of the Envoy for

Bavaria at the Vatican, dated January 17, 1915, in which Baron Otto von Ritter expressed his "fullest sympathy with the generous and magnanimous proposal of his Holiness," and stated that the matter was under consideration by the proper authorities of the Imperial Government.

Speaking for Austria-Hungary, in a confidential note addressed to the Cardinal Secretary of State, Prince John Schönburg-Hartenstein, Envoy to the Holy See, declared on the following day, January 18, 1915, that the Imperial Government "received with joy and gratitude the new magnanimous proposal of his Holiness, and accepted it on condition of reciprocity." He added that negotiations, similar in import to the suggestions of the Vatican, had been under way for some time with the nations at war with Austria, and had already attained a measure of success. Later, that is, on April 25, 1915, Baron Burian sent a dispatch to the Austrian Minister at the Vatican, in which he said that, although negotiations had been begun by Serbia, on October 8, 1914, through the offices of the Spanish Ambassador at Vienna, with a view to effecting an exchange of Austrian and Serbian civil prisoners, the Austrian Government, at that time, had not thought it opportune to accede to Serbia's request. Nevertheless, after a delay of four months, Austria finally agreed, the age limits for male prisoners being eighteen and fifty years. He explicitly stated that "the principal and decisive argument which had led to the determination was the desire on the part of the Austro-Hungarian Government to do honor to the magnanimous intentions of the Holy See in this regard."

The Minister of Prussia to the Holy See, his Excellency, Dr. Otto von Mühlberg, in a letter dated February 18, 1915, addressed to the Cardinal Secretary of State, said that the German Government had always been of the opinion that civil persons could not be kept as prisoners. Accordingly, Germany had proposed at the very beginning of the war that all citizens of the belligerent States should be permitted to return to their own countries. Serbia and Japan had already agreed to the proposal; physicians and ministers of religion had been exchanged with Great Britain and Russia, but not with France; there was no difficulty about the exchange

of women, but there were obstacles in the way of exchanging men. Germany was willing to allow male civilians of enemy countries above the age of forty-five to leave Germany, but neither France nor Great Britain would agree to this age limit for military service, the latter country fixing it at fifty-five and the former at sixty years. If these countries could be persuaded to permit Germans above the age of forty-five to return to Germany, the Imperial Government would consent to the Holy Father's suggestions.

On the same day, February 18, 1918, Mgr. Angelo Maria Dolci, Apostolic Delegate at Constantinople, forwarded to Rome the reply of the Ottoman Government, which was entirely favorable, but conditioned on the cooperation of Austria and Germany.

Russia had sent a reply three days earlier, on February 15, 1918, through D. Nedilow, Minister Plenipotentiary to the Holy See, who declared in a letter to the Cardinal Secretary of State that an agreement had already been reached between Russia on the one hand and Austria and Germany on the other, which carried out the wishes of the Holy Father with regard to all the classes mentioned in the Papal note, except that of male adults, for whom the age limit was set at forty-five years, or ten years younger than the age suggested by the Pope. Suspected persons were, of course, excluded from participating in the privilege of exchange. Belgium and Great Britain hastened to signify their acceptance of the Holy Father's proposal, the latter country, however, with reservations contingent on the conclusion of negotiations with Germany; and France, while not averse to the general scheme, declined to take action, until Austria and Germany had radically changed their methods of warfare.

In a little more than a month's time, therefore, the Pope had received communications from the various Powers, which made it clear that there was a disposition on the part of all to fall in with his wishes; but that, at the same time, there were difficulties in the way of their accomplishment, arising in part out of their divergent views on certain details of its application, and also out of their mutual distrust. The countries, directly approached, that is, Belgium, Great Britain and Russia, Austria, Bavaria and Germany, had all responded favorably, at least to the general proposition. Russia had already come to terms on the matter with Austria and Germany, and Serbia with Germany; Serbia and Austria were moving in the direction of an agreement, thanks to the Pope's influence; Great Britain and Germany had been spurred on towards a solution of their dispute by the suggestion of the Vatican, and were renewing diplomatic negotiations with a view to completing discussions begun, but interrupted; Turkey was disposed to do what the Holy Father wished; Belgium had signified her readiness to become a party to the exchange; and France had declared that the Republic was not averse to examining the Papal proposal, provided Germany reformed

her military methods and gave guarantees of good faith. From these details, which are taken from the *Civiltà Cattolica*, it appears that the Holy Father, in a very short time, had succeeded in setting on foot a gigantic movement for the benefit of humanity, or had given added momentum to it where it had already begun. Another paper will show how difficulties were smoothed away, and the acceptance of the Pope's proposal was made practically universal.

After-the-War Biology

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., Ph.D.

THIS war has afforded a striking instance of how far men may go in carrying principles into practice, even though the principles may be of very dubious value either from a moral or a scientific standpoint. Just about two generations ago, it was suggested by a very mild-mannered neurasthenic, on whom even slight intellectual effort produced rather serious consequences, that the varieties of life around us were due to the "struggle for life" and "the survival of the fittest." A number of scientists proceeded to take this hypothesis of the gentle Mr. Darwin very seriously. In Germany particularly, the theory was pushed to its very last conclusion. The rest of the world took this German dogmatism rather lightly, but after a while it became apparent that official Germany, at least, was deliberately preparing to put the doctrines to the test of practical experience. Even then non-Germans refused to believe their own eyes and ears and, as a consequence, they made no haste to prepare for the struggle to come. The nations which began the war were quite sure that they were the fittest to survive. It was their destiny to lead the human race and therefore their manifest duty to force their convictions on other people, no matter what this might cost in human life and suffering. Evolution must be fulfilled though the heavens fall. It was an obligation to the race to put down the unfit and uplift the fittest.

Then came the struggle as to the fittest to survive. That is, after all, the important question. The phrase, "the survival of the fittest," though often quoted as if it were supremely significant and quite utterly scientific, proves when carefully analyzed, to be a mere tautology. It proclaims, if the words that are understood be supplied, that those who are fittest to survive will survive, a pretty example of begging the question. It does not tell us, however, how the fitness to survive originates, which is after all the important underlying biological question, as was pointed out long ago by Professor Cope, one of the greatest of our American biologists.

As far as the human race is concerned, thank God, the question has been answered in such a way as to make the world safe for the many rather than for the few. That much-heralded principle is not likely to prove a new

source of deception, at least for generations to come. It must not be forgotten, however, that other phrases just as empty as "the struggle for life" and "the survival of the fittest" were leading many people to wrong conclusions and unfortunate conduct. For instance, we have heard a great deal about eugenics as the savior of the race, of a strong heredity which obliterates responsibility, of the inheritance of all sorts of qualities, of the well-raised one or two children who prove ever so much better than many children brought up in poverty, and a number of other things. All these were supposed to be the fruit of scientific biological investigation, whereas in point of fact they are only exaggerations of certain biological teachings which are not accepted by conservative biologists. Indeed, they often represent German materialism and its conception of the world, happily now put on a very different plane from that which it occupied before.

There is a very different set of views with regard to mankind, extremely conservative, which contradict entirely the radical conclusions supposed to come from biological science. Now that "the old order changeth, giving place to new," those interested in the sane views should read Professor Conklin's book on "Heredity and Environment in the Development of Men" (Princeton University Press). The book represents the Harris lectures for 1914 at Northwestern University, Chicago, which were afterwards delivered at Princeton. Professor Conklin's conservatism is characteristically at home in Princeton, where for so many years dear old Dr. McCosh taught scholasticism to the students. Though Professor Conklin, Princeton's present professor of biology, is a Western product, he came to Princeton twenty-five years ago and has grown to be thoroughly in harmony with conservative traditions. It is extremely interesting to find that his volume of lectures, though originally published in the midst of the many compelling interests of the war and the many diversions of mind which war-claims of all kinds entail, has gone into its second edition, this year, showing that conservatism is much more appreciated than is usually thought.

It is probable that the volume will give the earnest seeker after knowledge a better idea of how far biology can be applied to sociology and to the solution of the social problems than any other that has been recently written. Professor Conklin has not hesitated to take up and discuss even the most difficult problems that are before us at the present time. The treatment of the questions at issue is so thoroughly human, so deeply sympathetic and usually so well expressed that the author has written literature while preparing his lectures on science.

The chapter on genetics and ethics shows clearly how materialistic conclusions, their supposed interference with free-will, the limitation of responsibility and all the rest of it, are being eclipsed by the further light thrown on these subjects by deeper study. This section is all the more interesting because a considerable portion of it was

given as the presidential address before the American Society of Naturalists, in January, 1913, and must therefore be considered a thoroughly representative expression of scientific opinion, that is of the biological views of modern scientists on these important ethical problems. For most people it will be a matter of profound astonishment to find that Professor Conklin's biológico-social conclusions are of the very essence of conservatism.

For instance, he says: "In these days when individuals are demanding more and more freedom, it is well to remember that the best use that man has made of his freedom has been to place limitations upon it." He suggests that

In every age and country where demands for personal freedom have been most insistent and extreme, where men and especially women, have demanded freedom from the burdens of bearing and rearing children, as well as from other natural, social obligations, the end has been degeneration and extinction.

He has no illusions with regard to many tendencies in modern life. "The cry of Rachel," he declares, "'Give me children or I die,' has been turned by many modern women to 'I'd rather die than have children.'" That way lies inevitable degeneration, if not annihilation, of the race. "Cattell says that a Harvard graduate has on the average three-fourths of a son, a Vassar graduate one-half of a daughter." "As Galton has shown, the race that marries at twenty-two instead of thirty-three will possess the earth in two or three centuries." Professor Conklin does not hesitate to draw the ultimate conclusion, even in Scriptural language, of the fate of the nations that neglect opportunities for self-discipline and character-building. "An epitome of human history is contained in the words, 'He hath put down the mighty from their seats and hath exalted them of low degree.'"

With regard to inheritance, Dr. Conklin has, of course, dwelt very emphatically on the absence of any evidence for the heredity of acquired characters, that is, for the transmission of any qualities developed by any particular generation. In this, he expresses the conclusions of all serious thinking scientists of the present time. However, almost needless to say, this opinion is in direct contradiction to nearly all the popular notions with regard to heredity. Most people are quite sure that qualities acquired by fathers or mothers or grandparents may appear in their direct or immediate descendants. Indeed, most of the talk about the heredity of disease is founded on the conviction of the truth of this notion, but there is absolutely no truth in it. There are a few cases, out of many millions, that have been observed, in which apparently offspring have inherited such acquired characters, but these are really examples of another biological process known as induction.

Above all, there is no inheritance of acquired intellectual qualities, much as we might wish that there were such transmission. Father and mother may talk Greek, but the children will have to learn Greek. Not only this, but the much more individual qualities, intellectual genius

and mental talents of various kinds, are not the subject of inheritances. The seventh generation of an academic family whose direct male ancestors for six generations have been at the university, may have no more facility in learning, but much less, than the son of an unlettered farmer, whose ancestors had no education. It has become a proverb that the sons of great men often are nincompoops. This does not mean that they are much below the average, but by contrast with their father they seem to be almost defective in intelligence because they are just commonplace.

Conservative biology has some rather striking things to say with regard to modern education. According to Professor Conklin:

One of the most serious indictments against modern systems of education is that they devote so much time to training memory and intelligence and so little attention to the training of the will upon the proper development of which so much depends. He adds that "Any education is bad which leads to the formation of habits of idleness, carelessness, failure, instead of habits of industry, thoroughness and success." He is quite sure that easy lives and refined surroundings have less educational value than is commonly supposed. He suggests that we are all strangely blind with regard to these matters and that what we commonly call a good environment is frequently the worst possible, while what is often called a bad environment may be the best possible. Hardships, discomforts, hard work are not disadvantages, but have often proved stimuli which give sturdy bodies, good judgments and good morals, the best qualities that education can give.

Such, then, is the newer biology, a promising sign, indeed. Haeckel, it is to be hoped, is eclipsed forever, and the brave Mercier and his school are in the ascendancy.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six-hundred words.

France's Catholicism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Apropos of "Is France Still Catholic?" of Father Ménager, rebutted by "J. W.," New York, in AMERICA of October 26, please permit me an extra bit of your valuable space.

I am an American, with no strain of French blood. I spent some time in France, going there a few years back, with a mentality toward French Catholicism very similar, in respects, to that of J. W. Today, however, I am decidedly of Father Ménager's mind, though I have seen nothing immediately of France under the religious revival induced by the war, which means that I never saw France at her best or something supposedly approximating her best.

The difficulty, nay, the impossibility, of estimating remote history in the light of the present is well known. Equally hard is it to evaluate a remote country in terms of domestic institutions and a domestic spirit. Permit me, therefore, to say that J. W.'s prospect is seemingly too restricted for him to take issue, in the premises, with, say, a Father Ménager.

It is accepted in American politics that the party in power is on advantageous ground; that it is well placed to guard and to mend its fences against rival inroads. The French Government, be it known, is in a well-nigh impregnable position against a Catholic political onslaught. Does J. W. see this? I judge not;

nor can he come to grasp it satisfyingly except through the intuitive process.

Those Catholic amateur statesmen, and others, indeed, who plead for government ownership, would open their eyes wide were they to realize its ultimate significance, its *potentia*, specially for evil. Yes, it is verily the negation, the absorption, of democracy, and readily becomes the synonym of an almost inconceivable intolerance. The French Government is the most highly centralized political authority extant, and such centralization was amassed neither openly nor undesignedly, so far as this religious matter is concerned. The Catholic French peasant, and many others, and many higher, still clinging to the traditions and practices of imperialistic government, were taken unawares. The evil was deep-seated before they came into consciousness of their democratic powers, if indeed some realize them even yet. In this sense, the great mass of Catholic French people were scarcely to blame for their shackling. Centralization of power by intrigue, then, became the unbeatable weapon which French politicians and statesmen wield so effectively today. Ah, truly, it were securer to be ruled by a single despot than by a horde of them masquerading under the appellation of republic.

Government ownership! The incumbent French power controls railroads, telegraphic communication, has a monopoly on even match factories and the tobacco industry, and through such agencies browbeats the laborer, or manipulates his vote with a zeal and an intelligence not unworthy of his satanic majesty. J. W. will scarce see all this axiomatically; its history will confuse him; but, for the moment at any rate, he may find a little specific data for consistent examination into a not infrequent American inquiry. "Why don't French Catholics oust their Government?"

Intrigue! Leave it to a Masonic power for dirty politics! There it controls the ballot-box, has a system of national espionage to out-Kaiser the Kaiser's unholy work abroad, is unscrupulous in its use of the mails to know where it stands in particular quarters or to offset impending reverses; and it bewilders, as it manipulates, sentiment respecting political issues and ostensibly rival candidates; and the press is wholly subsidized for any and all government projects. The contending parties are an undecagon, so that Catholics of even pronounced loyalty, astuteness, and fighting quality are thoroughly disconcerted on election day, while the peasantry and royalists, stunned or confused or disgusted, remain at home; aye, even members of the same religious house are often (or may be I had better say, sometimes) hopelessly at issue, and the community vote can thus be suicidal. Indeed, J. W. will not easily become reconciled to stalwart Catholicism in face of such seemingly anomalous procedure. However, the greatest French fighting spirits, from the Catholic standpoint, see the crux of the problem clearly, and they figure for freedom. We may well leave the solution to them, for they alone are competent to deal with it, if, indeed, it can now be dealt with by or through human agency. The Republic of France has been splendidly victorious, and countries, specially France, are not inclined to change their systems of government except in the wake of reverses or disaster. Will the outcome of the war, then, not help the Catholic cause there? Yes, in the renewed fervor that so many influences have brought about, hardly for any lengthened period otherwise.

Americans, as possibly J. W., tell us that what France needs is leadership, and what the French Catholic requires is backbone. The good French Catholic, and he rules, is anything but supine, never fear; and as for the leader, well, even he, to carry significance, must at least get under way. At present the man who essays the role is prone in his path before the second step. It is impossible to make a religious "fuss" in France. The Government knows immediately how to localize it. As noted, it controls the telegraph, the telephone, the press; it has in every town of size a host of soldiery, plus the gendarmerie, quickly "to conciliate" differences. Congregating of any type without permit

is proscribed, and restrictions go with the specific permission. Political issues must not be discussed in churches, must not; while the Catholic press has to guard its words or whine harmlessly under the muzzle. Marshal Foch is a recognized leader, Catholic leader, if you will; but not even Foch, fearless and undaunted, would be able to lead far this hero-worshipping people in this particular direction. He would be cut down before his propaganda could reach beyond the immediate environment of his initial pronouncement.

An example is offered of this leadership business: At Dunkerque, a few years back, a pastor thought to lead his flock into the forbidden pastures. He knew that to start he had to be artful, and he was. First Communion Day is a great occasion among the French; it is still so, though, in reality, it is no longer the first reception that is commemorated. Said pastor announced that there would likely be no First Communion Day "this year," as the poorer children had not proper clothing for the occasion; "but," he added, "if matters of the immediate future go as they ought to go (he was alluding to an impending election in which a well-known fighting Catholic was a candidate) clothing will be forthcoming for these children, for better times will be at hand." The Government, for once, was taken unguarded, for the Catholic was the choice. Immediately the charge of "politics in church" was effectively raised; a second election was ordered; and you may well know the result, for the French Government is unbeatable by ballot when it gets set for the counting process, and it is generally mighty well set.

"By their fruits you shall know them!" Herein Father Ménager vindicates Catholic France, and herein J. W. condemns it, so to speak. In a broad sense, Catholic France never grew lukewarm. Tepidity is anything but a French proclivity. Yes, indeed, there are sad spectacles in sections of France, or were, specially among the men folk; God in His tabernacle is not known, or better, is no longer known, hence not esteemed, not loved, not served; even Easter finds French hearts frozen, and estranged from the Eucharistic Christ. But, go round the broader field, and you shall find Catholic France abundantly represented, true, fervent, faithful.

Lacordaire, from the pulpit of Notre Dame, had, on occasion, to salute "Holy Ireland" as "perhaps the most faithful of countries," and none of us would care to contend here with the great Dominican. But, as one whose emotions run to Ireland, whose whole nature is prejudiced for Ireland, I failed, after diligent search, to find there evidence of the religious vehemence and self-sacrifice for religion for which France, in its supposedly decadent day, everywhere, or almost, gave ample manifestation. Aye, in its darkest hour before the war it was still sending forth as leaven for the nations, zealous missionaries, priests, Sisters, Brothers, in numbers to exceed handsomely the aggregate of the rest of the Catholic world.

Inconsistent, intolerant, misunderstood, irreligious, *religious* France, eldest daughter of the Church, loveliest withal, and greatest beyond compare, accept our heartfelt, albeit anomalous, salutation, as we pray the Prince of Peace to vouchsafe to you the freedom we Americans enjoy and that you so well deserve but have too seldom known!

San Francisco.

B. J.

The Truth About Poland

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your reviewer of "Poland in the World of Democracy," by Anthony J. Zielinski (Laclede Publishing Company, St. Louis), in your issue for November 9, did excellent service to the Polish cause by giving the book a space that it in every way deserved, and by tersely bringing out the salient points developed in the eloquent volume. But there are two points, which, of course, could not be developed at length in the review, but which leave a permanent impression in the mind of the reader after perusing the book: the very unique nature of the book, and the necessity of spreading reliable books on Poland.

This latter truth is significantly brought out by the Hon. John W. Weeks, United States Senator, in his introduction to the volume. He remarks that Polish history and the endeavors and aims of the Polish people are altogether too little known to the American public, and that this absence of sufficient knowledge of Polish affairs, is very likely to result in serious disadvantages to the proper settlement of the Polish question at the Peace Conference.

This is a compelling truth which should elicit the attention of those who are at the head of the Polish question, and those whose office it is to write intelligently and correctly of the huge problems which are shaping today and in which Poland and a proper settlement of the Polish question form so prominent a part. It is, then, to my mind, a matter of the keenest importance, alike to Poland and to the world at large to bring to the knowledge of the American public, in fact to the knowledge of the vast English-speaking world, the historical character of Poland, her ideals of freedom and equality of rights, if only to set at naught the result of the false reports spread by the usurpers with a view to justifying their political rape by saying that the Poles are not fitted for self-government. Its facts must be told. Poland must be presented to the English-speaking world in her true light. She must be restored without delay to her rightful place in the public esteem.

"Poland in the World of Democracy," carries out this program in a very constructive fashion, as it brings home to English readers the truth about Poland, with that fervor and strength of conviction of which a Polish soul is capable when dealing with Poland's violated rights. The distinctive service the author rendered the public by presenting the book is that in the space of 261 pages, he succeeded in tersely showing in the light of history, how, where and in what way Poland rendered service to civilization by her struggles for the advancement of democracy, now proclaimed and fondly embraced everywhere in the world. In narrating Poland's outstanding historical activity, her progress in jurisprudence and her relation to the smaller nations, the author incontestably proves that Poland, in her own way, was the first democracy after Rome, and that this very constructive and salutary fact, which today should have the sympathy of the world, resulted in her partition by an irresponsible autocracy.

The author unites the prominent historical facts in Polish history by the golden thread of historical sense. There is the ceaseless struggle of Poland with Prussianism, the onrush of the Prussians upon Slavic territories, the terror and anxiety which this onrush brought upon the Lithuanians and the Ruthenians and their consequent voluntary union with Poland in an endeavor to create a defensive alliance against the ill-boding monster of Prussianism.

Poland had for centuries stood on guard, the very incarnation of right, while around her might grew in the form of aggressive and rapacious Prussia. This historical truth is glowingly described and illustrated by facts, and supported by quotations invariably drawn from reliable English, French and American sources. There runs also, through the pages of the book, a surprising analogy of close kinship between the two great republics; the one, Poland, which fell under the blows of autocracy; the other, America, which raised her hand over the arrogant and iron-clad autocracy which dared to threaten the freedom of the world.

The book outlines the political kinship of America and Poland. History records the disinterested struggle of Kosciuszko and Pulaski for American independence, while America, through the mouthpiece of her President, has spoken to the world, with that strength and conviction of which truth and right alone are capable, of the undying right of Poland to an independent and united life.

Right must triumph. The Cross, the emblem of Christianity,

will open its arms to receive humanity, reborn and ennobled in its trials and sufferings.

The book is eloquent and strong literature, incontestably and tersely refuting the falsehoods and prejudices which the usurpers everywhere spread about the Poles as being unable to govern themselves. It should have the widest circulation so that it may reach the vast masses of the English-speaking world, which will needs be industrially, economically and politically interested in a free and independent Poland.

Indiana Harbor, Ind.

ST. LAUDYN.

Teaching Catholic History

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In AMERICA for November 23, T. F. M. seems to grow excited over my remarks on the teaching of history. The *Tablet's* report was not at fault, but I sent to it some remarks not made at the meeting of teachers. One of these was about Francis S. Key. Has the last word been spoken on our revolutionary history? May there not be depths of its sea of information yet unsounded? Admitting all the valuable data of "The Catholic Encyclopedia" and Mr. Griffin's work, with what degree of certainty may we declare that Generals Stark, Wayne, Sullivan and Montgomery were not Catholics? In his historic series Mr. Elihu S. Riley, L.H.D., of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., and author of a history of Annapolis, Md., says: "It may be rationally concluded they were of Catholic belief." He also states: "It has been proved beyond controversy that Catholics filled half of our Revolutionary army and that the countries that aided us were Catholic peoples and without their support, the American colonies never would have achieved their independence."

Brooklyn.

T. A. H.

The Just Aspirations of Ireland

To the Editor of AMERICA:

These are times when many are asking: How about Ireland? And where is she to fit in during these world-smashing days? How is she to fare amidst the general crash of governments and nations and during the reconstruction of the world that is now about to take place? As I understand it, the Irish people and their descendants everywhere are neither cold nor indifferent towards other oppressed peoples and nations. Far from it; they wish all such well and hope they may secure for themselves everything that the President has stated as the results to be gained by the war; namely, that all nations, great and small, shall be sole mistresses of their own destinies, and that each shall have exclusive control in its own household. This the Irish people demand for Ireland, and in all its fulness; they will be satisfied with nothing less.

Our press is a strange institution and exceedingly difficult to understand unless one is behind the scenes. For instance, it is shouting itself hoarse about the liberation of certain small nations, but rarely or ever does it mention Ireland; and when it does the reference is rather apologetic. Hints are given that Ireland is somewhat of an obstacle in the way of Great Britain and that in order to free herself from this encumbrance England should grant some little concession, if only to keep the Irish quiet. But never once, not even by accident, is it said that Ireland should receive the same rights as the President demands for other nations. And this, I regret to say, is also true of some of our Catholic writers, men who owe all they are here, and hope for hereafter, to their Irish fathers and mothers. Ireland was old before the nations the press wants liberated were born, Palestine and Armenia possibly excepted. Before most of these nations were generally heard of she helped to Christianize and civilize them, and will in all probability be present at their burial.

No better argument for democracy could be given than the wonderful, seemingly impossible achievements wrought by the great democracy of the West, in turning what threatened to be an overwhelming defeat for the Allies into one of the greatest

victories of all times, perhaps the greatest! And all this was done with the necessary preparation in about eighteen months. But there still remains work to be done in order to bring order out of the chaos resulting from the war, to re-establish law founded on liberty and justice, and finally to secure for all the nations, great and small, without exception, the blessings promised by the victors. Ireland should take her rightful place among the sisterhood of nations, the place intended for her by God and nature; a free and independent State, the friend of all, the enemy of none. She will then keep step to the tune of liberty and equity to all, as she has ever done when it lay in her power, dealing fairly and justly with all her people, high and low, rich and poor, learned and illiterate; knowing no north, no south, nor east nor west, but only one united and regenerated Ireland.

Dorchester, Mass.

F. J. CONLAN.

Play Fair

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your issue of November 23 contained a communication under the caption "Let us Play Fair." That is just the point. The public has subscribed \$170,000,000, the result of hard work and sacrifice, as a gift to our boys over there, the distribution of which is intrusted to seven organizations. To do anything else but present that gift would be a violation of trust.

Duluth, Minn.

MARION McDONALD.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of December 7 an attempt is made by "J. P." to controvert my statements regarding the unfairness of the K. of C. in dispensing to the soldiers and sailors certain articles entirely free of cost, while other welfare organizations charge for them. The first sentence written by "J. P." contains a misstatement. In no place in my communication of November 23 have I mentioned the Y. M. C. A. Your correspondent, while drawing numerous erroneous conclusions and inferences from what I have said, misses completely the point at issue. He marshals a group of high-sounding words, "economy," "self-sacrifice," "generosity," and of course does not fail to press into service that hackneyed term used so frequently in our day to cover a multitude of sins, the good word "patriotism."

Now here is the point at issue: If the monies used by the K. of C. to procure the things they give away were contributed solely by Knights of Columbus, I will go farther and say, were contributed solely by Catholics, the K. of C. might, though such action would be of doubtful propriety, be justified in giving those articles away. But such is not the case. To raise the money to carry on its war work, the K. of C. appealed to all classes of people, Catholic and non-Catholic, and nobly and generously all responded. Without the financial aid of our non-Catholic people the K. of C. never could have done the work it did in looking after the material and spiritual welfare of our Catholic boys in the service. Let us never forget this fact.

I submit that it is not fair, not in accordance with the golden rule, to use the monies given to us for war work by our non-Catholic friends and neighbors to win a popularity and secure an advantage over these same non-Catholics. To me it looks small, and not at all knightly. Neither as Knights of Columbus, nor as Catholics, are we in need of such advertising, and we should not countenance such. It has all the earmarks of proselyting, a thing we denounce in others. In all fairness, let us refrain from doing ourselves what we blame in our neighbors.

If "J. P." will read the last paragraph of my communication in your issue of November 23 he may be convinced that he was in error in some of his inferences, and let me also remark that it is not at all "presumptuous" or "impertinent" for any man, no matter how humble or obscure, to express his honest convictions on any subject in which he is interested. There are times, even, when it may be a duty to do so.

Atlantic City.

FRANK J. ATKINS.

A M E R I C A

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1900, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

AMERICA will have a special correspondent at the Peace Conference, in the person of Mr. J. C. Walsh, late editor of the "Montreal Star."

God's Christmas Gift

THE whole world had gone astray, and in our great misery God gave us His Son for our comforting. Only God could have known the possibility of the Incarnation; only God could have encompassed it; only God could have brought it to pass with its message of sweetness, and its ineffably touching humility. For He was given to us as one of ourselves, as one to whom we might always look as our Elder Brother, our intercessor with our common Father in heaven. Mary and Joseph could find no home for His birthplace, but only a stable. He did not come to us like a child of the poor, for even the poor have homes, but like a little Outcast.

No candle is there and no fire in that rude hut, and her little One shivers in the cold. But Mary wraps Him in swaddling clothes and before she lays Him in the manger, holds Him to her loving breast. For if He is God, is she not His Mother? He falls asleep, soothed to rest by the sound of her voice, comforted by the caress of her gentle hands. With unconcerned eyes the beasts near the manger look on. Soon our forefathers in faith will kneel before the sleeping Child, to adore Him as their God, their Saviour. Soon the song of the Angels, with its glorious promise of peace to men of good-will, will announce the coming of the King. But now all is silence, darkness. Masterful Rome, ruling from sea to sea, with Greece, fallen yet regnant through her philosophy and art, the sensuous Orient, rich in the luxury of gold and perfumes, the dark stern countries of the North, even His own people, knew nothing of the stable at Bethlehem. Few were thinking of this Gift of God; fewer would have sought It in a stable on a bleak hillside. But God gave His Gift to a heedless world, and in the giving a new epoch began.

By His coming Jesus Christ transformed the face of the earth. He forged, first of all, an unbreakable bond, uniting all men as brethren. He is truly of our race and

nation; He has taken to Himself our frame, our flesh, our nature; He has become like to us in all things, save only sin. Made the first-born of many brethren in the Incarnation, He elevated the natural kinship of all in Adam to a relation that is sacred. As brothers, we are equals; as brothers, we ought, in St. Paul's words, to prevent one another in charity; and because the Christ Child, God's Christmas Gift to the world, is our true Brother, we are all, in His intention, children of God and heirs of Heaven.

For four years, the world was in arms, nation against nation, brother against brother, and the Prince of Peace seemed forgotten, with all that He came to teach. Now that the cannons are silent, after those years of carnage, men are weary and hearts are softened. Today, the whole world is at peace, as it was when the Christ-Child was born in Bethlehem. May Christmas, 1918, mark the beginning of a new era in which the peace and love borne to the world by the baby hands of the Child of Bethlehem, shall be firmly established in the hearts of all men.

The Fire of Liberty

THE fire of American liberty is burning bright these days in the hearts of our people, even though it shows dim on the pages of many papers more devoted to bread and beer than to lofty ideals. Throughout the length and breadth of the country an impulse little short of Divine is urging men and women of all classes, ranks and creeds to forgather in huge throngs, both to protest their devotion to freedom and to demand liberty for oppressed nations. This sign of our sincerity, this symbol of our unselfishness in behalf of other peoples is the most consoling feature of the after-war period. America went to battle that democracy might not perish from the earth, but rather might be extended to all lands where people sat in the darkness of tyranny and ate the sodden bread of near-despair. And now that the flush of victory is fresh upon them, Americans have come together by scores of thousands to send their encouraging voices across the seas to nations less fortunate than themselves. This is the significance of the Jewish throngs, this is the meaning of the throngs upon throngs of citizens of Irish birth or extraction.

The Jews and the Irish are oppressed and they must be set free to live the full lives of upstanding men, to enjoy the natural, inalienable right of every nation: freedom. The nature of these meetings is such that the Governments and the bespotted coteries of capitalists who are attempting to belittle or thwart them, had better step surer before it is too late. The passion that is now loose has never suffered a serious and enduring check from autocrats or soulless captains of industries. Thwarted here, it has turned there, and finally, vexed and harassed too much, it has turned into a mighty anger that consumed its persecutors. And why not? Shall the selfishness of a few deprive a nation of the exercise of an inalienable natural right? Never. Shall prejudice or

filthy lucre, coined from the tears and blood of widows and orphans, stand in the way of legitimate national aspirations?

The Irish are right: they should and must have freedom. Their souls are worth more to them and to the world than English fish or English mutton or English aristocracy. The Irish in America are right too, entirely right in pressing this matter on the American Government at a time when so many of their sons and brothers, American citizens, are being brought from the battlefields of Europe to New York, helpless, God pity them, from wounds received in freedom's cause. The Irish problem is now the world's problem, our problem in a special way, for America struck the final blow that won the war. American boys of Irish blood did not give eye or hand or foot that the home of their fathers and mothers might be still further exploited by England. And what of the American boys of Irish extraction dead on the battlefields of France? Did they die that Ireland might be still further crushed? We shall see.

Now is Ireland's time: the sympathy of the great throbbing heart of the working world is with her. It is Ireland's time to shake her gyves till the whole world rings with the horrid sound, to lift her voice again and again in demand for justice, until England learns that a dangerous tide is rising fast, and it is rising fast. And Ireland, not England, is atop of the water with peoples of all races and classes and ranks and creeds, political and otherwise, for this is a question, not of race or class or rank or creed, political or otherwise, but of elemental justice. And the problem is: Ireland has a right to freedom and Ireland must have freedom.

Wherein Catholic Schools Differ

"**W**HEREIN lies the fundamental difference between your schools and the public schools?" Catholics are sometimes asked. Seldom has the answer to this important question been better put than by Mr. William Henry Moore in "The Clash," his well-reasoned and temperate book on Canada's bilingual question. He shows that the root of the difference is this: Catholics want their children to be educated, not merely instructed, and the State can only instruct. Enlarging on his statement of the case, Mr. Moore continues:

The French-Canadian is not ground to so fine a business edge in the Church school as the English-Canadian in the State school. But he is taught a philosophy of life. We may not all agree with that philosophy, but are we mending matters by leaving the explanation of the whys of life to the precarious home-training, and the inadequate one-hour-a-week education of the Sunday-school? In the Church schools everywhere, the object of education is the same: it is the student's realization of his or her place in the scheme of the universe. The schools are "flowing streams making glad the city of God." The Church has seen no reason to change its mind. It continues to reason—in 1918 as in 1418—that life here, being a stage preparatory for life hereafter, becomes a period of schooldays. Earthly life is not an end in itself, it is only a means to an end. "Today we are weaving the structure we are henceforth to inhabit." Since man has been placed on

earth that he may make himself ready for God's kingdom and acquire a capacity for God's righteousness, that then becomes the real business of life; all other things are comparatively insignificant. . . . There is no sharp distinction to be made of what is man's and what is God's, for all should be—and, in fact, all is—God's. . . . This reasoning is that of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches alike. . . . The Roman Catholic Church carries the argument to what seems from the premises a logical conclusion, that the school and the Church are inseparable. -

What Mr. Moore says regarding conditions in Canada is also true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Catholic and public schools in the United States. In neither country are the State schools anti-religious, as they are elsewhere, for "God is admitted to the schoolroom, but only as a 'neutral.'" As for the attitude taken toward God's place in education, in some countries abroad, a State official is reported to have remarked in the course of a speech he made before the scholars: "It is said that we have expelled God from the schools. It is an error; one can only expel that which exists, and God does not exist." May the day never come when an official appointed from Washington ever dares make a similar statement before the pupils of an American public school. To keep such a peril remote is the present duty of our voters and legislators. Staunch and true American Catholics meanwhile will continue of course to make the noble sacrifices required for the maintenance, extension and improvement of our educational system, from parish school to university. Then Our Divine Lord and His incomparable Mother, far from being merely tolerated neutrals in the classroom, will be the heavenly Guides and Guardians of those unnumbered Catholic children whose enlightened patriotism will be the bulwark of the Republic and whose uncompromising piety will make joyful the city of God.

The Ghost of a Postmaster General

EBENEZER HAZARD is not a name that is mentioned with veneration today, but for all that, he may have been an excellent man and father. At any rate, he was Postmaster General in the old days when men still powdered their hair, and the capitol of the United States was in Wall Street. All Postmasters General, who take themselves seriously, grow gray and haggard in devising means to cut down expenses; Ebenezer was no exception to the rule, but like many another official, he pulled down with one hand what he built up with the other. At the very time when the good citizens of Boston, New York, Baltimore, Charlestown, and even of Philadelphia, were deep in the discussion of the faults and merits of the proposed Federal Constitution, Mr. Hazard was unfortunate enough to take history by the forelock, and forbid all publishers to exchange copies of their newspapers by mail. Just how much the thrifty Mr. Hazard saved by this device, in a day when newspapers were almost as rare as Republicans in Texas, is one of those great subjects which can be fitly treated only by some bespectacled young gentleman in search of matter for a Ph. D. thesis.

But, whatever he saved, Mr. Hazard suffered the loss of his official position. There was a military man of renown in those days, one George Washington, and on occasion, he could wield a peppery pen. This was one of those occasions, and in a letter to John Jay, General Washington said that Mr. Hazard's economic schemes were doing much mischief. They induced a belief, he said, "that the suppression of intelligence at that critical juncture was a wicked trick, contrived by an aristocratic junto." This is strong language, but at the first opportunity, President Washington appointed Samuel Osgood to the unhappy economist's cares, and thereafter Mr. Hazard disappears from history. Under the newer dispensation, publishers continued to disseminate "intelligence," with the aid of the mail service, for upwards of a century, and then we came upon another "critical juncture" in our country's history. At this critical juncture, the ghost of Postmaster General Hazard stalked forth to Washington.

The precise amount of "intelligence" smothered by the recent resumption of Mr. Hazard's discredited policy is, of course, open to question. But there is no question that the principle which led President Washington to disapprove even an indirect attack by a government official on the legitimate freedom of the press is as valid as ever. Government censorship of the press, especially when vested in one political officer, has no place in these United States.

Self-Discredited Guides

A RECENT editorial in the New York *Sun* lays stress on a suggestion more than once made of late, that great care must be exercised in the future to see that our rising youth be not indoctrinated by means of their text-books with views and facts that the critic is pleased to deem un-American. The precise offense of the text-books under censure lay in this: that though emanating from our greatest seats of learning, with the approval and even assistance of a number of American scholars and matter-of-fact school boards, nevertheless these volumes were devoted to the German myth. They extolled Germany and things German, they held up to admiration what we are now taught to abhor, they influenced the impressionable minds of youth to look with interest and admiration towards that land from which we now are bidden to turn away with horror and contempt.

German methods, German ideals, German scholarship, German books, periodicals and publications of all sorts, met the student at every turn in our public schools, while large hosts of ardent American students went by direction to Germany in preference to other lands. Indeed, the very men who are now loudest in their denunciation of Germany and all her works and pomps, were equally loudest in their endorsement of all things Germanic during the half-century before the war. President-Emeritus Charles W. Eliot of Harvard is an example of the blind

devotee become the fanatic adversary. In this matter the name of Charles W. Eliot is legion.

With the objective value of the past or present estimate of Germany and the Germans we are not now concerned. The point to be scored regards the reliance we are now, and for the future, to place upon our own self-confessed misleaders of public opinion and misguiders of youth. For four years our educators have bitterly assailed the Germans, and for forty-four years previously they heaped every praise on them. Now the spirit, the culture, civilization of a nation do not change with lightning-like rapidity. Even Darwin postulated long ages for slight changes in a race. August, 1914, worked no "substantial" change in the Teutons. What they were from 1870 to 1914 that they were from 1914 to 1918, and vice-versa. It is not the Germans, but it is the loudly proclaimed opinion of American publicists and pundits that has veered round, and weather-vanes have never ranked high as guide-posts. Either the American laudation of the German from 1870 to 1914 was honest and well-founded, or else our pundits' more recent judgment of Germany is correct and sound. In the first event, what is to be said of the judgment of the last four years? In the second event, what is to be thought of the men who for forty-four years failed, after long study and close inspection, to understand what they now style the "Beast of Berlin"?

That our learned university men and writers could not, during two-score years, pierce through the veneer which the Germans so easily threw off in a few weeks of war, argues ill for the acuteness of America's intelligence, yet we are still expected to accept the judgment of these men in other things of vital importance. Shall Dr. Eliot, having on his own confession so egregiously misled us for so long, still be allowed to pose as a prophet and professor, and beguile us into fresh errors and mistakes? Or shall we send the whole rout of our so-called instructors, university dons and newspaper editors packing, bag and baggage? In commerce and finance we Americans are canny enough; in things of the mind are we to be so simple as to listen still to voices that have consistently and egregiously misled us in the past?

Catholic educators and Catholic publicists are not involved in this catastrophe. American Catholics, including those of German birth and descent, even when recognizing Germany's points of real excellence, never have been blind to her faults and failings. They have not been the blind leaders of the blind, unthinking advocates of everything German, unreasoning foisters of Teutonic methods, Teutonic ideals, Teutonic philosophy and science upon the American people. Catholics, and German Catholics to boot, have been the only ones to point out the limitations of German excellence and the danger of indiscriminate Germanolatry. Our large non-Catholic universities, our "free and independent press," these, as they themselves now admit, were the American people's chief agents of deception. Shall they continue to be so?

Literature

TODAY'S CHRISTMAS CAROLS

THE Middle Ages, long pitied or despised, are now held in reverence. Even that sincerest flattery of imitation is not denied them. Philosophers are lauding and quoting St. Thomas; Dante has come into his own; the Gothic Cathedrals are studied as the greatest triumph of man's genius and are more or less successfully copied in every city of Christendom; sociologists are praising the old guild system and endeavoring to devise ways of adapting it to the conditions that we know. Miracle and morality plays are again being acted; poets are finding in the story of Bethlehem the theme for a thousand lovely poems; and Christmas carols, old and new, are being sung. In our cities Christmas Eve is gay once more. From long past days our lately pessimistic one is learning not only to rejoice, but to rejoice in the Lord.

The new carols, although modeled on the old, are unmistakably of today. They lack not simplicity, but that very childishness of simplicity which characterizes the earlier songs. They are more polished; they are never undignified. Their devoutness is never intruded upon by allusions to the yule-log, or to games, or feasts, or great draughts of Christmas ale. The old carols were not the voice of the cultured few or even of the educated, but of the great mass of the people, hard-working, pious, jovial, pleased to have a holiday; and in their lives a holiday meant the commemoration of some event in the life of the Master whom they loved and served whole-heartedly, but not to the exclusion of a frank interest in the commonplace good things of this life.

Being children of our own day, when the old carols and the new are placed side by side, we find the new more to our taste. Unquestionably some of the newly written Christmas songs are beautiful, although Gilbert Chesterton thinks that our unchildlike age is not ready for carols. Below the title of one of his he wrote, "To be sung a long time ago—or hence." This quaint carol of his, "Christmas Song for Three Gilds," begins:

St. Joseph to the carpenters said on Christmas Day:
The master shall have patience, and the 'prentice shall obey;
And your word unto your women shall be nowise hard or wild:
For sake of me, your master, who have worshiped Wife
and Child.

Another carol of his, lovely in its sweetness and simplicity, is included in the volume called "The Wild Knight." Two of the stanzas read:

The Christ-Child lay on Mary's lap,
His hair was like a light.
(O weary, weary was the world,
But here all is aright.)

The Christ-Child stood at Mary's knee,
His hair was like a crown.
And all the flowers looked up at Him,
And all the stars looked down.

Among others of our well-known living poets Sara Teasdale has felt the age's hunger for joyous, tender love of the Baby-Christ, God Incarnate become little, and poor and helpless, for the sake of us. Part of her "Christmas Carol" runs:

The Angels came from heaven high,
And they were clad with wings,
And, lo, they brought a joyful song
The host of heaven sings.

The Angels sang throughout the night
Until the rising sun;
But little Jesus fell asleep,
Before the song was done.

More at home than others with the tremendous mysteries of our Redemption, Catholic poets have written the most intimate and most loving of all carols. Not only the traditions but the realities of the Ages of Faith are theirs. The Christ-Child is at home on their altars; in Holy Communion He nestles in their hearts; to them the dear Little One of Bethlehem is not a mere historic figure, however exalted, but Emmanuel, God with us. In Theodore Maynard's "Drums of Defeat," for instance, we find this lovely carol, sung supposedly by Our Blessed Mother:

Lay quietly Thy kingly head
O mighty weakness from on high,
God rest Thee in Thy manger-bed—
Sing *Lullo—lullo—lullaby—*
O splendor hid from every eye!—
La—lullo—lullo—lullaby.

Ye mild and gentle cattle, yield
Room for my little Son to lie;
Your God and mine is here revealed—
Sing *Lullo—lullo—lullaby—*
Naked beneath a naked sky—
La—lullo—lullo—lullaby!

Deal kindly with Him, moon and sun;
No bird to Him a song deny;
Ye winds and showers every one
Sing *Lullo—lullo—lullaby!*
For men shall cast Him out to die . . .
La—lullo—lullo—lullaby.

Joyce Kilmer was too intensely Catholic and too intensely human to have escaped the lure of so devout and tender a theme as the first Christmas Night. His "Gates and Doors, a Ballad of Christmas Eve," is one of the most beautiful of its kind.

There was a gentle hostler
(And blessed be his name!)
He opened up the stable
The night Our Lady came.
Our Lady and Saint Joseph,
He gave them food and bed,
And Jesus Christ has given him
A glory round his head. . . .

There was a joyous hostler
Who knelt on Christmas morn
Beside the radiant manger
Wherein his Lord was born.
His heart was full of laughter,
His soul was full of bliss
When Jesus, on His Mother's lap,
Gave him His hand to kiss.

Surely these are lovely, but is any carol more beautiful than Louise Imogen Guiney's "A Carol of Beasts," with its sweet interpretation of the dull, kindly ox and ass, and its tender naming of the Babe, "our Delight?"

The Ox and the Ass,
Tell aloud of them:
Sing their pleasure as it was
In Bethlehem.

From the Newly-Born trails a lonely cry!
With a mind to heed, the Ox turns a glowing eye;
In the empty byre the Ass thinks her heart to blame;
Up for the comforting of God the beasts of burden came.

Softly to inquire, thrusting as for cheer
There between the tender hands furry faces dear.
Blessing on their honest coats! tawny coat and gray,
Friended our Delight so well when warmth had strayed away.

To a war-weary world to which peace has come at last, songs such as these, that hymn the gentle Child-Prince of Peace, are more welcome than ever before. The simplicity of their beauty is very soothing; their tenderness, balm to the sore hearts of those who now mourn: one day to be comforted.

FLORENCE GILMORE.

ROSA MUNDI

Not with crashing thunder His footsteps under,
But silent as His Father's Word the Lord comes down.
Like a flower unfolding in His Mother's holding,
Blossoms the Rod of Jesse's root in David's town.

O shepherd folk keeping your watch unsleeping,
Come see the Word that's come to pass in Bethlehem!
O Magian sages dreaming of the world's redeeming,
Come see the wondrous Rose that's sprung of Mary's stem.

For your help and healing this is God's revealing,
This is the Rose of all the world that hidden here doth lie,
But high shall be Its growing and heaven-high Its showing,
When on the trellis of the Cross the bruised Rose shall die.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

REVIEWS

The Sacred Beetle and Others. By J. HENRI FABRE. Translated by ALEXANDER DE MATTOS. With a Preface by the Author. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. \$1.60.

Our Humble Helpers. Familiar Talks on the Domestic Animals. By JEAN-HENRI FABRE. Translated from the French by FLORENCE CONSTABLE BICKNELL. New York: The Century Co. \$2.00.

Happily we have now learned to expect every few months a new volume of Mr. De Mattos's excellent translations from the works of this great French entomologist. Dodd, Mead & Co. have already brought out seven other volumes in this series, besides another book entitled "Insect Adventures," all of which have been favorably reviewed in these columns. Anyone who is already interested, or desires to have his interest aroused, in insect life should not fail to read Fabre, for that genius devoted all his years to a close and accurate study of the nature and habits of the bee, the fly, the wasp, the beetle, etc., and has recorded in language far removed from that of the dry-as-dust scientist the results of his observations, for many of his pages read like a poet's. This Catholic entomologist's conclusions, moreover, are based on the sound principles of a rational philosophy and to Fabre all the wonders of the insect-world are strong arguments for design in the universe.

The chapters in the first of the books under review tell how the "pills" which the common dung-beetle may be seen pushing energetically along the road any summer's day, do not contain, as is widely believed, its eggs, but its food. The author also pulverizes that romance about an overworked beetle running off to get help from his friends. That second or third dung-beetle that sometimes appears has come to steal, if possible, the first beetle's ball, but for no benevolent purpose whatever. M. Fabre did find, however, after long and patient study, where the sacred beetle and its cousins deposit their eggs, and how their young are wonderfully provided for. But those who have read the other volumes of the series will need no urging to secure this one.

"Our Humble Helpers" was written for children and is just the book to give the benighted boys and girls of our cities who think geese are "silly," that all chickens come from incubators, that ducks get wet, that a cat's whiskers are purely ornamental, and entertain a thousand other false notions about domestic birds and beasts. For Uncle Paul tells Emile, Jules and Louis, his little listeners, so many real wonders about the denizens of the farmyard that there is no need of drawing on the realms of fable. Another book M. Fabre wrote for children is called "The Story Book of Science." It is a \$2.00 volume published by the Century Company and would make an excellent Christmas present. It has already been favorably noticed in AMERICA.

W. D.

Studies in English Franciscan History, being the Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in 1916. By A. G. LITTLE, M. A. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$3.00.

Things Franciscan, or at least relating to the medieval English Franciscans, seem to have been taken as his province by Andrew G. Little, professor in the University of Manchester, England. Beginning with his "Grey Friars in Oxford," which appeared in 1892, the last quarter of a century has seen published nine books relating to the Franciscans of Medieval England written or edited by him. The present book not only adds much in point of information to his previous works on the Franciscans, but it manifests, too, the author's growth in fairness towards the Friars. There is a deal of most favorable testimony in the present book, and whatever may be wanting is due rather to the modern Protestant's inability to properly adjudicate the motives of a medieval Catholic, especially when that Catholic belongs to a monastic body whose every feature has for centuries been maligned and misrepresented. The author, for example, can discern the exaggerations written by Matthew Paris, the monk, regarding the Friars, but he does not seem to suspect that many other things their contemporaries said about them are exaggerations too. He often lays too much stress on the statements of hostile critics, and he fails to understand the language and actions of the Friars because he cannot enter into a medieval Catholic's habit of thought. Regarding the observance of poverty, for instance, the author does not see that a sum of money received by the Friars themselves as an endowment is quite different from funds left in the hands of third parties who expend the income in perpetual alms for the Friars. In asserting that "Auricular confession only became general and compulsory after the Lateran Council in 1215," and that "It is possible that compulsory auricular confession would never have been enforced without the Friars," the author is quite wrong. For the legislation of 1215 was merely meant to correct abuses regarding the infrequent use of the Sacraments, and the Fathers of the Council in making that law could not have had non-existent Friars in mind.

It is clear from Mr. Little's book, however, that the Friars occasionally brought about such municipal improvements as the laying down of aqueducts, etc.; that they were the fearless defenders of the persecuted Jews, though it cost them the favor of the people; that they championed the cause of the poor man against his wealthy oppressor, and that their success in promoting general education was remarkable.

J. F. X. M.

The Clash, a Study in Nationalities. By WILLIAM HENRY MOORE. Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, Limited. \$1.75.

The author of this excellent book, who is the son of a Protestant minister, in a chapter on "Tolerance," relates this anecdote to show how firmly the average Ontario Protestant "believes that the French of Canada are priest-ridden":

Not long ago I was traveling through the Province of Quebec with a friend who, pointing through the car-window to a French village that clustered around a massive grey-stone church, said: "There is a picture which illustrates the burdens imposed upon the people of Quebec by the Church of Rome." "Do you know Richmond Hill, just north of Toronto?" I asked; and he did. "About the same population," I suggested, and he agreed. "There are five churches at Richmond Hill," I continued, "with five separate costs for heating, lighting and preaching. Which do you think pays the more for religion—the people of the village we have just passed or the people of Richmond Hill?" Then we talked of other things.

The foregoing is a striking example of the good-tempered way in which the author repeatedly meets, throughout his cogently reasoned book, the arguments brought against the Church by bitter partisans in Canada. Going back to the Quebec act he maintains the French-Canadians' right to have their language

used in their Ontario schools, he denies the alleged race-superiority of the English-Canadian and brings forward in proof many convincing arguments. The French-Canadians are not inferior to their English-speaking fellow-countrymen, is Mr. Moore's conclusion. They are only "different." His pages on "French Canada and the War," now that the great conflict is over, can perhaps be read with as much calmness as profit.

The French-Canadians, the author shows, are a race more French than the French. For 300 years they "have had a common history and common traditions; for a hundred years or more they have been the exclusive guardians of those traditions," but loyal British subjects too. Their high birth-rate and their thrifty love of the land has made them numerous, contented and prosperous. The trouble in Canada seems to be at bottom an economic struggle between the two races regarding the country's future development. Mr. Moore has marshaled his facts and arguments so well that every one who wishes to understand the French-Canadians' position should read this book. In his preface the author demolishes the "Pope-pro-German" calumny.

W. D.

Crusaders of New France, a Chronicle of the Fleur-de-Lis in the Wilderness. By WILLIAM BENNETT MUNRO. New Haven: Yale University Press. \$3.50.

This interesting book is Volume IV of the recently launched "Chronicles of America Series" of which Allen Johnson is editor. Brief and unbiased works written in English on colonial Canada are so rare that Mr. Munro's excellent book meets a real want. For it is clear that he has read widely on his subject, digested his material well and with a sympathetic historian's imagination he has succeeded in bringing seventeenth-century Canada vividly before the reader. The author wisely minimizes the effect of Champlain's defeat of the Iroquois, near Ticonderoga, remarking that its consequences were not at all "so far-reaching as some historians would have us believe." Considering the handicaps under which the colony struggled along he reaches the conclusion that "The marvel is not that French dominion in America finally came to an end, but that it managed to endure so long."

In the last five chapters of the volume: "The Church in New France," "Seigneurs in Canada," "The *Courcours-de-Bois*," "Agriculture, Industry and Trade" and "How the People Lived," Mr. Munro is particularly readable, for the pictures he draws of the rulers, missionaries, trappers and Quebec colonists stand out like faithful portraits. His enthusiastic admiration for the Jesuit Fathers who evangelized the Indians is hardly surpassed by that of Catholic authors, and he delights in showing how the French race's finest qualities shone out in cheerfully bearing the hardships and privations of colonial life. "The Crusaders of New France" is finely illustrated and is dedicated to the author's "good friend, Father Henri Beaudé."

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

AMERICA readers who, during the past few weeks, have been following with interest the remarkable series of articles that have been appearing in this review on the various aspects of the Irish question will no doubt be glad to know that Dr. Maloney's five papers have just been published in a pamphlet entitled "Ireland's Plea for Freedom" (America Press, \$0.10 a copy, \$7.00 a hundred). With a thorough grasp of the "Irish Issue's" long, sad history and of its present-day bearings, the author calmly and cogently discusses the "American," the "English," the "Irish," the "Ulster" and the "International" aspect of the question and proves with unanswerable logic that unless President Wilson, representing the American people at the coming Peace Conference, is successful in securing "self-determination" for Ireland, almost the oldest of those "small nations" whose highest interests the United States is believed to have

deeply at heart, the countless children of Erin, whose blood and brains and brawn have done so much to make America what she is today, can justly charge us with cowardly ingratitude. Dr. Maloney's pamphlet should be scattered far and wide.

The December 22 number of the *Catholic Mind*, which ends the sixteenth volume of that valuable little fortnightly, opens with Alfred Rahilly's excellent paper on "The Reality of Religion," in which he treats of the so-called "conflict" between science and faith. The spiritual atrophy that students sometimes experience can be prevented, he shows, by striving to know as much about our religion as about other subjects and "above all, to live it." There follows a thoughtful and timely paper by Paul J. Sweeny, S.J., entitled "'No Room' and Christmas," then the Rt. Rev. Edward A. LeBlanc, D.D., offers some salutary counsels on "Sunday Observance," and Father Drum tells "How Luther Mutilated the Bible." At the end of the number is the volume's index, which shows that during the past year the *Catholic Mind* has furnished its readers with more than eighty articles printed on nearly 650 pages.

"Dr. Adriaan" (Dodd, Mead, \$1.50), the latest story of Louis Couperus, the Dutch novelist, to be turned into English, is a depressing study of a modern Holland family. The story's central figure is "Addie," a young physician of generous impulses, who makes his father's big house the somber home of various helpless, feeble or eccentric members of his mother's family. His buoyant, resourceful spirit is all that keeps the household together, and he certainly deserved a better wife than the selfish, faithless woman he has. The author is very successful in making every character in the book stand out with vivid consistency and he seems to have been well translated by Mr. De Mattos. There are wide discrepancies of merit in the stories Ambrose Bierce has to tell in "Can Such Things Be?" (Boni & Liveright, \$1.50). There are weird tales connecting dreams with realities, strange narratives of stranger disappearances, wild stories of savage murders; "Moxon's Master," "The Middle Toe of the Right Foot," "The Damned Thing" are capable of holding any one's interest. The attempted explanation of spiritistic phenomena is wholly engaging, if not entirely convincing. Humor is near to horror in many of the stories.

Mr. A. T. De Mattos has made a good translation of Maurice Maeterlinck's "The Betrothal" (Dodd, Mead, \$1.50), a five-act fairy play, which is a sequel to "The Blue Bird." Under the guidance of Berylune, Tytyl searches for a sweetheart, and with the help of his ancestors and descendants finds her at last. The author contrives to weave into the symbolism of the play a number of his philosophical vagaries, assuring his readers, for example, that "Anything that's ugly isn't true, never has been true and never will be," and dragging in eugenics and evolution. Carolyn Wells's "Such Nonsense: An Anthology" (Doran, \$2.00) ought to enable its readers to find any of the whimsies or parodies that were missed from the compiler's other collections of humorous verse. There is nothing better in this volume than Hilaire Belloc's things and Miss Wells's own amusing fugue-movements on such motifs as "Peter, Peter, Pumpkin-Eater." The parody on the Shepherd Psalm, however, to take no higher ground, is in decidedly bad taste. This is the way that the publishers start the "Jabberwocky" hymn:

"Twas Harpers, and the Little Browns
Did Houghton Mifflin the book
All Munsey were the Benzigers,
And the Doddmeads Outlook.

Marie Corelli has just added another to her long list of novels. "The Young Diana" (Doran, \$1.50), is in the true Corelli style, exuberant in imagination, moderately interesting and designedly thrilling. It treats "not of sex, nor of money, nor of fighting.

but of life." A middle-aged spinster offers herself as a subject for an experiment which restores her lost youth and gives her surpassing beauty, but leaves her without emotion of any kind. The story brings her to a sort of sublimated state of sympathy with nature, devoid, however, of interest in humanity or herself, and in this unsatisfactory condition it leaves her.—"Shavings" (Appleton, \$1.50), a novel by Joseph C. Lincoln, is another character-study in the eccentricities and idiosyncracies of that primitive New England life, which insured for the author the immediate success of his "Mary-Gusta." As an intensive portrayal of a peculiar type, now fast disappearing, the book is a success; but the narrative lags over a multitude of details, and even so facile a pen as Mr. Lincoln's could not give to so impossible a character as "Shavings" a compelling interest.—"Skyrider" (Little, Brown, \$1.40), by B. R. Bower, is a story of western ranch life and depicts the various characters with a humorous effect. Both hero and heroine have hair-raising escapes, the airship playing an important part in these adventures.—"The Peace of Roaring River" (Small, Maynard, \$1.50), by George Van Schaick, is a peculiar romance in which Madge Nelson, dejected, sick and weary of life in New York, comes into the life of a North Canadian woodsman. The story does not hold the reader's interest very closely.

"Fighting for Fairview" (Appleton, \$1.35), by William Heyliger, is a good book for schoolboys. It is filled with interest and follows the varying fortunes of the school nine and its captain. The absolutely necessary lesson of school spirit is brought out well by the action of the hero who actually gives up the captaincy because he considers that this will benefit his school.—"Clematis," and "Arlo" (Putnam, \$1.25 each) are both written by Bertha and Ernest Cobb. They first tell of a little orphan girl whom a kind-hearted policeman found alone one day, sitting pensively on the curbstone. She knows no parents, no friends, except Deborah, a small white cat, which is her constant companion even after she enters the Orphans' Home. A love for nature, the beautiful fields, blooming flowers, and clinging vines is Clematis's treasure; and this, together with her loving disposition, finally leads her to a happy home with grandpa. It is a good story for girls of ten or twelve. "Arlo" is a companion volume for little boys of the same age. It relates the adventures of a lad, the son of a Count, who has been placed under the care of a "Dame Henda." She allows the boy to become the companion of a traveling musician and varied are the adventures of these two until success as a musician crowns the lad's efforts. The Count, his father, is restored to his former power and recognizes his son, long lost.—The J. B. Lippincott Company's excellent and finely illustrated books for children, the latest volumes of which will be found under "Books Received," can be warmly recommended to the puzzled Christmas shopper.

Lytton Strachey is a clever English journalist who chose as his prey four "Eminent Victorians" (Putnam, \$3.50): Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale, Dr. Arnold and General Gordon, and then proceeded to sketch their careers. The biographer who "leaves out the warts" is a familiar type, but Mr. Strachey is another variety altogether, for he puts nothing but the warts in. A cynical scoffer at Christianity who seems to believe that no one ever acts from supernatural motives, the author stresses so the human weaknesses in the four sincere Christians he attempts to portray that a wholly distorted picture of them is given. He seems quite incapable of understanding a noble character. Owing to his Macaulayan gift for phrase-making and his caustic wit, Mr. Strachey has written an entertaining book, but let no one call it faithful biography. The account of Gordon's campaigns and of Florence Nightingale's work at Scutari is particularly readable.

In a recent anthology called "Corn from Olde Fieldes" (Lane) which Eleanor M. Brougham has prepared is this naive fourteenth-century Christmas carol which she found in a British Museum manuscript:

Jesu, sweetē sonē, dear!
On poor-full bed liest thou here,
And that me grieveth sore;
For thy cradle is as a bier,
Ox and assē be thy fere,
Weep I may therefor.

Jesu, sweetē, be not wroth,
Though I have no clout nor cloth
Thee on for to fold,
Thee on to fold, nor to wrap,
For I have neither clout nor lappe,
But lay thou thy feet to my pappe,
And wite thee from the cold.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- D. Appleton & Co., New York:**
German Submarine Warfare: A Study of Its Methods and Spirit, Including the Crime of the "Lusitania." By Wesley Frost. Illustrated. \$1.50; Mexico from Cortez to Carranza. By Louise S. Hasbrouck. Illustrated. \$1.50.
Richard G. Badger, Boston:
The Beginnings of Science, Biologically and Psychologically Considered. By Edward J. Menge, M.A., Ph.D., M.Sc. \$2.00.
The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis:
An American Family, a Novel of Today. By Henry Kittell Webster. \$1.50.
Dodd, Mead & Co., New York:
America in France. By Major Frederick Palmer. \$1.75.
George H. Doran Co., New York:
Joyce Kilmer: Poems, Essays and Letters. Edited and with a Memoir by Robert Cortes Holliday. Two Volumes. \$5.00; The Sad Years. By Dora Sigerson. \$1.25; The Young Diana, an Experiment of the Future. By Marie Corelli. \$1.50.
E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:
American Problems of Reconstruction, a National Symposium on the Economic and Financial Aspects. Edited by Elisha M. Friedman. \$4.00.
Ginn & Co., Boston:
Essentials of American History. By Thomas Bonaventure Lawler, A.M., LL.D. With Illustrations in Color by N. C. Wyeth. Revised Edition. \$1.12.
Harper & Brothers, New York:
Edgewater People. By Mary E. Wilkins Freeman. \$1.35; A Writer's Recollections. By Mrs. Humphry Ward. Illustrated. Two Volumes. \$6.00; Doctor Danny. By Ruth Sawyer. Illustrated by J. Scott Williams. \$1.35; Four Years in the White North. By Donald B. Macmillan, D.Sc., F.R.G.S. Illustrated from Photographs by the Author. \$4.00; Impressions of the Kaiser. By David Jayne Hill. \$2.00.
Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:
The Doctor in War. By Woods Hutchinson, M.D. With Illustrations. \$2.50; *En Repos* and Elsewhere Over There. Verses Written in France, 1917-1918. By Lansing Warren and Robert A. Donaldson. With a Preface by Major A. Pratt Andrew. \$1.25; Silver Lining: The Experience of a War Bride. By R. W. F. \$0.60; My Company. By Carroll J. Swan. \$1.50.
B. W. Huebsch, New York:
Women and the Labor Party. Edited by Dr. Marion Phillips. \$0.50.
P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York:
The Hand of God: Theology for the People. By Martin Scott, S.J. \$1.00.
Alfred A. Knopf, New York:
The Modern Novel, a Study of the Purpose and the Meaning of Fiction. By Wilson Follett. \$2.00; Fairies and Fusiliers. By Robert Graves. \$1.00.
J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia:
"Passed as Censored." By Bertram M. Bernheim, Captain M.C.U.S.A. \$1.25; Gulliver's Travels. By Jonathan Swift. \$1.35; The Waterboys and their Cousins. By Charles Dickens Lewis. \$0.75; The Adventures of a Brownie. By Miss Mulock. \$0.50; General Crook and the Fighting Apaches. By Edwin L. Sabin. \$1.25; Keineth. By Jane D. Abbott. \$1.25; The American Boys' Engineering Book. By A. Russell Bond. \$2.00.
The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia:
The American Jewish Year Book 5679, September 7, 1918, to September 24, 1919. Edited by Samson D. Oppenheim.
Longmans, Green & Co., New York:
In the Valley of Vision. Poems Written in Time of War. By Geoffrey Faber, Captain. \$1.00.
Moffat, Lord & Co., New York:
Fair Play for the Workers. Some Sides of Their Maladjustment and the Causes. By Percy Stickney Grant. \$1.60.
Princeton University Press, Princeton:
Wasp Studies Afield. By Phil Rau and Nellie Rau. With an Introduction by William M. Wheeler. \$2.00.
G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:
The Reckoning: A Discussion of the Moral Aspects of the Peace Problem and of Retributive Justice as an Indispensable Element. By James M. Beck. \$1.50; Studies in Literature. By Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, M.A. \$2.50.
Rosary Press, 487 Michigan Ave., Washington:
The Path to Peace. By Vincent C. Donovan, O.P. \$0.20; in lots, \$0.12.
Small, Maynard & Co., Boston:
Anthology of Magazine Verse for 1918 and Year Book of American Poetry. Edited by William Stanley Braithwaite. \$2.00.
The Stratford Company, Boston:
After the War—What? By James H. Baker. \$1.00.
Yale University Press, New Haven:
Human Nature and Its Remaking. By William Ernest Hocking, Ph.D. \$3.00; War Poems from the *Yale Review*. With a Foreword by the Editors. \$1.00.

EDUCATION

Back to Bethlehem

NOT until the greatest cataclysm of history had made the structure of civilization totter, and with the tottering brought suffering and death to some millions in swamps and blood-drenched fields, and heart-aches to other millions, did the near-thinkers begin to realize that the dogma of Christ's Divinity was not quite as useless as it had appeared. It was whispered about, with some persistence, that a phantom form, bearing a striking likeness to the exiled God-man, had been seen walking sadly among the stricken, staunching wounds and moistening parched lips. "An old wives' tale," no doubt, was the comment of the near-thinkers. Possibly it was. Yet the legend typified a need which was fashioned into words by H. G. Wells, when he made the discovery of a human and a suffering God.

STOPPING SHORT OF THE TRUTH

THE near-thinking world, engulfed in the maelstrom of shattered theories, caught up the revelation and whispered in bated breath: "There is a human and a suffering God, one who can sympathize with us in suffering, and guide us in moments of perplexity." It was a poor makeshift, a helpless sort of God, but it was human and it was suffering, it could sympathize and counsel. Mr. Wells might have made a further discovery had he remained static long enough to allow the process of cerebration to pursue its normal course. He might have discovered that the Divinity of Christ was a truer answer to Mr. Britling's perplexities. That, perhaps, was too much to expect. It would mean the abandonment of previous conclusions, and the esoterics had already decided that a God was not born in Bethlehem, and the exoterics had picked it up, and so, it must be true. But Mr. Wells, when hopefully accused of getting back to old-fashioned doctrines, stated in no uncertain language that he was not. With Mr. Wells and his concepts, if we may so dignify them, we have little concern. He has, however, given concrete expression to the truth that in times of trial and doubt, the human heart feels strongly the impulse to find a God who can give it support and counsel, such a God as was born of Mary in Bethlehem of Juda. In times of peace, when dangers do not lurk so threateningly in dark places, there seems to be an inclination to crush this impulse, and "theories" recommence their interrupted parade. But just at present, dangers are not quite so remote as might be suspected.

NEO-PAGANISM?

CHIEF among them, and casting its influence over all the others, is the mental attitude with which we are to approach each separate problem which confronts us. Many who feel the pulse of the times maintain that the greatest peril threatening the country is a clash between Christianity and an emphatic neo-paganism. Quite possibly, this new system will take the form of the glorification of what is purely natural. Doubtless it will be argued that the idealism which exerted a decided influence on our participation in the war, justifies an absolute confidence in the goodness of human nature. As a consequence we may expect to see an effort to relegate the supernatural further into the background, and hear with greater insistency, the sounding brass of a brotherhood of man, and a resurrected uplift utterly divorced from revealed religion. God may not be left out of the printed page nor off the lecture platform, but He will be so lost in the maze of platitudes tending to idolize human nature, that He will be practically a negligible quantity. The clash will come between the idealization of human nature and the idealism taught by Christ.

As is often the case, educational theories give us a hint of the development of the tendencies of the times. And a lecture, delivered recently in Carnegie Hall by Dr. Eliot, seems to justify our apprehensions. Its subject was "Defects in American

Education Revealed by the War." He has at last discovered what the Catholic Church has been dinning into the ears of a listless world for the past few centuries, that, "A bad result of this condition [of forbidding religious instruction in the schools] is, that there has been in the public schools no systematic inculcation of duty towards parents, neighbors, teachers, friends or country, or of reverence toward God." The result of this is, as Dr. Eliot asserts, an utter ignorance of the "spiritual" on the part of many trained in these schools, for they "have developed in the presence of the hardships, horrors and risks of war, sentiments which may be properly called religious, and might be expressly inculcated in American public schools." Therefore, shall we at last see the light which the Catholic Church, practically single-handed, has been trying to shed on the darkness, even before we came face to face with the hardships, horrors and risks of war? Shall we at last admit that we were wrong, and that the solution of this problem is contained in the development of a school system, wherein each child may be taught the religious principles of his own particular creed? Not by any means. The public schools must keep their identity, no matter how dismally they have failed. Dr. Eliot has another solution. He suggests the preparation of a manual of religious teaching to be used in the schools. This manual "would contain no dogma, creed or ritual, and no church history; but it would set forth the fundamental religious ideas which ought to be conveyed in the schools to every American child and adolescent in the schools of the future. Such teaching would counteract materialism, promote reverence for God and human nature, and strengthen the foundations of a peace-loving democracy."

TRUE IDEALISM IN THE SCHOOL

NOW this is just exactly what it would not do. It is nothing more than paganism, pure and simple, and would be as much a counteragent to materialism, and as productive of reverence to God, as paganism has been in the past. For there are in the human heart tendencies which are ever at work to counteract the better impulses of which Dr. Eliot speaks. When we begin to teach paganism in our schools and keep Christ in exile, we shall have taken the first step toward the positive development of the idealization of the natural, which produces a mental attitude, utterly powerless to cope successfully with any of the real difficulties of life. What is needed in education, and every phase of life, is the development of the idea which was found so necessary in the time of trial through which we just passed, the idealism taught and exemplified by one whose counsel is unerring. The full development of such an idea leads but one way: to the cave on the Bethlehem hillside. By all means, let us emphasize the brotherhood of man and the betterment of the human race; but the uplift must be such as Christ effected and the brotherhood must count the God-man in its ranks. If the world wants to stand up to the problems of the future, it cannot go back to ideas which Plato and Seneca enunciated long before Dr. Eliot discovered them; it cannot take Mr. Wells' makeshift-God as an exemplar. It must go over to Bethlehem, and find there the suffering God who gives and stabilizes His counsels by Divine authority.

JOHN F. DUSTON, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

From Tenement to Home

ONE disconcerting fact of the day is the absence of home-life for a vast portion of our populace. In the tenement districts, homes are but shelters to which men go to eat and sleep. This, however, is not necessarily an indictment of the immigrants who largely crowd these neighborhoods. There is little choice for them. From early morning till late at night the streets of the slums surge with life. All, from toddling tots to the aged folk of faltering step, are driven out of the uninviting, confining quar-

ters that are home. Every possible household duty is done on the curb; and every hour, that is not by some unalterable compulsion spent within doors, is passed on the streets; or, if these are repellent because of rain or cold, in the various amusement places that abound, simply to accommodate these virtually homeless people. Under such conditions there can be little family life. The natural bonds between husband and wife, parents and children, sisters and brothers, are broken. Each seeks his own friends, his own interests, his own pleasures on the streets.

THE FRUIT OF THE SLUMS

IT is from these localities that our delinquent classes generally come, if not always the dangerous law-breaker then more often the petty, repeating offender. The number is far in excess of the normal, considering even the congested population. The delinquency may be largely traced to the shattered family life, the impossibility of parental control over children who haunt the streets, the necessity of finding some occupation, honest or otherwise, for the long hours of freedom.

This is a serious indictment of the tenements, but nothing new or startling is set down. The facts are well established and have been reiterated time and time again by those who are familiar with conditions. Then why is the menace to body and soul permitted to exist?

Such colonies are now mainly filled with foreigners. Their countrymen live in these districts, their tongue is spoken there, they flock there. This is to be expected, and while it serves to maintain wretched conditions, it is in nowise a bar to their elimination. The second consideration is that these neighborhoods lie in the immediate vicinity of the industrial and business centers of the city. The worker lives close to his work, and, where salary is small, this is important. Here is the element originally responsible for these overcrowded neighborhoods. In this connection, though, there has been a most encouraging development in the past few years. As yet this is in its initial stages, but already it bids fair to eliminate much of the wretchedness of the slums.

If the crowding of industries within certain confines resulted in the crowding of workers within others close by, it likewise meant that when the adjoining residential districts had been taxed to the utmost to accommodate, no matter how miserably, the workers, it became difficult to secure the increased labor often demanded by factories. More important, the factories themselves were hampered in their progress; property was lacking for necessary extensions to the plant, and enormous building expenditures had to be incurred in adapting structures to limited ground space. Furthermore, the jamming of many industrial concerns into one locality, resulted in great confusion and delay in the shipping of products. Accordingly the industries moved, some of them to the outskirts of the city, where land was cheap and plentiful. The supposition was, of course, that the worker would follow his work. Some few did, but the majority remained in the old localities, in the tenements and the crowded streets with their array of theaters, dancing pavilions and skating rinks.

THE TENEMENT STRONGHOLD

THERE was a time when, in the morning, the street cars carried thousands cityward and, in the evening, out again to the residential districts. Now increasing numbers are carried each morning out to the city's limits, where the large industries are located, and back again in the evening to the congestion of the tenement colonies. Near the huge plants will be found signs, inviting labor to investigate the "steady employment, healthful surroundings and a living wage." Still the employment problem of these factories is frequently pressing, and sometimes entirely discouraging. The explanation may be sought in various causes. It is to be feared that the tenement-dwellers hesitate to separate themselves from what they have come to

view as essential to life, the hundred varied amusements that are offered by the streets in the heart of the city and in the sections immediately adjoining. With many, the consideration is no longer to live in proximity to their work, but to live close to the whirl of pleasures. The nightly motion-picture, the nightly dance, the nightly pool-game, these have come to be considered the purpose in life. The whole outlook on life is sadly distorted.

There is another consideration. A family may have cause to hesitate long before venturing to move from a locality with which it has become intimate, into a wholly strange neighborhood. That pioneering instinct that once begot the courage to break the ties of the old country, has been dulled. For many immigrants, American life has been the bitterest disillusionment. From this experience, there has resulted hesitation to uproot again the home and transplant it, even a few miles, though the change holds rich promise of improvement. The question of the ties of nationality should not be so important, the new districts could be settled like the old blocks. Why, then, cannot the veins of the slums be opened wide enough to permit the surplus population to pour out? They are often opened. Still, few are awake to the opportunity of escape. Men need, first of all, a word of encouragement and next, a word of sound counsel.

THE NEEDED WORD

WHAT is the alternative? A continuation of the shame of our present slums; continuation of the abnormal prevalence of crime; continuation of the lack of family ties; continuation of the menace to body and soul that lurks in the tenement areas. Surely the prize is worth the effort. But who is to give that word of encouragement or counsel that will change these conditions for family after family? Who but the unselfish friend of the immigrant, to whom alone the latter can go with confidence that his every welfare, temporal and spiritual, will be considered? Who but the parish priest and his curates, with the staff of responsible laymen whose services they may be able to command? That the factories on the outskirts of the city are given help is no consideration. But it is vital that the opportunity be grasped for procuring for many a poor immigrant-family some semblance of home life. The question of financing such a family, of protecting it against tricks of real-estate sharks, of locating its property, are small concerns that will right themselves readily, once the family has been given the spirit that makes it anxious to find for itself a true home.

L. F. HAPPEL, M. A.

NOTE AND COMMENT

A Statement and a Counter Statement

LAST week a salaried employee of the Government presented a list of names to a sub-committee of the United States Senate sitting in investigation of propaganda. The list was very long and the sub-committee decided to suppress part of it. But the part suppressed bids fair to become more famous than the part published, for now the very streets of New York are making merry over the fact that the names concealed were the honorable names of some of America's most loyal and honored citizens. So! In regard to the names revealed—in many cases, at least, the names of men who have done valiant service for the country—the eastern press declared the list had been marked "important list of names," by a German agent. The western papers, on the other hand, said the list was so labeled for the Department of Justice. More, the eastern papers put into the mouth of the secret service man testifying that this list contained the names of men pro-German before our entrance into the war, and some few who were pro-German after our entrance into the war; the western papers had it that the men were pro-German before our entrance only. And now the secret service man has settled the whole problem in the usual way. In a belated interview he pro-

tests that when he submitted the list of thirty-one names "he told the sub-committee the names were to be regarded as simply a German view of those who might be regarded as friendly." He declared "it was not a list prepared by the Department of Justice" and proceeded to say that no suspicion could be attached to some of the persons mentioned.

Oh!

Bone-Dry Florida

THE New York *World* of December 9 printed this rather amusing letter about Prohibition in Florida:

The Prohibition mind is most perplexing, to say the least. We have just witnessed the adoption of the constitutional amendment for nation-wide Prohibition by the Florida State legislature. Now we are informed that a "bone-dry" law was also passed at the present session making that State "dry," but with this proviso: "That on and after January 1 next, possession of more than four quarts of whisky or more than twenty quarts of beer by any one person shall be a misdemeanor. Drunkenness is punishable by a fine of \$500 or a year's imprisonment."

Great is Prohibition, and hypocrisy is its prophet!

Apparently virtuous Floridians are determined not to become too holy. It is a bit difficult, too, to understand why each person is limited to four quarts of whisky and twenty quarts of beer. Why not be reasonable and allow four and a half quarts of the former and twenty and a half quarts of the latter? Florida babies, also, need alcohol baths every day. But why complain? The law seldom considers babies in need of a bath, but men who do not need a bath. And this law has done well by the latter. For, no doubt, there is a way of keeping the flask just six drops below four quarts and the jug four drops below twenty quarts. Moreover, if there are ten members in a Floridian family, there can be forty quarts of whisky and 200 quarts of beer in the house, every moment of every hour of every day of every month of every year—enough to keep all the back teeth in Florida afloat. Has Prohibition vindicated itself once again or is the correspondent of the *World* joking?

The Catholic Woman's Success

AT this particular time in history, more than ever before, as Rita Connell McGoldrick says in the *Quarterly Bulletin* of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, the Catholic woman faces her greatest opportunity in history. Nothing is better fitted "to nurture the new spirit that is about to be born to a heart-torn and bleeding world" than her influence and gentle motherhood. But it is her convent training, she adds, that will enable her to rise fully to her magnificent responsibilities:

It will help her to set the example by her charity of speech, her modesty of manner and of dress, her respect for poverty, her swift compassion and sympathy for the suffering, her prayerfulness and her faith, to a world that is more than ever before ready to be convinced that womanhood is the fountain-spring of all good, that good women are capable of the most heart-breaking sacrifices, that they are capable of sharing the burden equally with man, in war-times in his absence, or in his home in times of peace. Her example will shed an influence all about her. In this capacity she will achieve a success far above the material and social triumphs of those whose lives are not enveloped by the spirit of sacrifice.

To the little Belgian mother, destitute and alone in some barren corner of her poor country, cherishing her children and teaching them to pray in the midst of wreckage and hardship, surely success in its sweeter form has come. She has developed her own possibilities to their limit of noble self-sacrifice. She has time for those about her. Discounting the comfortless externals of her life, she has time for God.

That is what success means to the Catholic woman—not social position, brilliant marriage, political prestige, but victory over self with duty done effectively and valiantly. It

means the attainment of an ideal that holds all of charity, and the willingness to help. It is a development of soul with nothing of malice or resentment. It is a never-failing sense of high-mindedness and honor. It is constancy in prayer, that heart and mind and soul be properly directed in the work at hand so that the last mile-stone of life's tedious roadway will find the girl-graduate a developed woman of rare virtue, who has left her footprints indelibly behind her, and whose spirit and example will be the incentive for other tired wayfarers to "carry on."

This is the true conception of what success should mean to the Catholic woman.

Soldiers and Moralists

APPARENTLY our soldiers are growing tired of moralists who put the emphasis in the wrong place. A recent issue of the *Stars and Stripes* takes issue with Mr. Rockefeller for "exploding far-sweeping plans" for a boxing carnival in aid of the United War Work. According to the press the aforesaid gentleman caused the explosion "as a result of numerous protests against boxing on account of its brutality, by ministers of religion, throughout the country." The *Stars and Stripes* proceeds as follows with the report of Mr. Rockefeller's speech:

Further, The committee has adopted resolutions setting forth that funds derived from social games, golf tournaments or any sporting events held on Sunday will be refused. And

Mr. Rockefeller, in a speech made yesterday, dwelt on the great spiritual significance of the Unified War Work campaign about to begin.

This cited, the above-mentioned paper remarks:

First, dear Dr. Doney, president of Willamette University, who tells an Oregon audience that he would stop the shipment of cigarettes to the army in France. And now Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., who, in behalf of his fellow-committeemen and "ministers of religion throughout the country," grows pale at the thought of boxing, social games and golf tournaments held on Sunday, and talks exaltedly of spirituality.

We herewith bet our October pay (which we optimistically expect to get about next Valentine's Day) that we know what from now on will be the doughboy's favored appellation for dear, nice, prim and precise Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and the type of well-meaning but misguided fellow-citizens he personifies.

This item was scarcely digested when the *Detroit Free Press*, under date of December 6, informed its readers that at a Baptist convention, held in Owosso, Mich., at which the ministers implored the Federal Council of Churches not to let the Pope near the Peace Conference, the Rev. C. L. Vreeland

protested against what he termed the cigarette wrong perpetrated by the U. S. army and through the Y. M. C. A. in spite of that institution's protest. He declared that "It was a criminal shame that the nation had sold itself to a soulless tobacco corporation and a great pity that so many men blindly 'fell for' this curse and blight to the splendid clean fellows sent to fight for the cause of world freedom."

Soldiers at Camp Custer sent this protest to the *Free Press*:

The article that appears in this morning's issue of your valued paper and which bears date at Owosso, Michigan, does not carry any weight with the men in service at this Post. We desire to take particular exception to the reported quotation of the Rev. C. L. Vreeland of Grand Ledge.

May we advise this learned minister that the boys in this army of ours are not going to hell just because we see fit to smoke an occasional cigarette or two. Again, we dislike the attitude of men such as Mr. Vreeland and others who are worrying about the morals of the men in the army. Maybe, if Brother Vreeland would don the khaki and stand reveille with us for a few cold mornings and then go about the camp for a few weeks he would quickly discover that the morals of the soldiers were not in the least injured by the use of a harmless cigarette.

The soldiers are right, entirely, absolutely right; they "are not going to hell" because they "smoke an occasional cigarette or

two." Better leave their few comforts to them, and preach to them love of God, prayer, purity, respect for lawful authority, and so on. These things they understand, but not the fanaticism which sets down the smoking of a cigarette among the deadly sins. Smoke your cigarettes, soldiers, and may you always be as you have been, the best army in the world.

A Man's Earning Power "From His Neck Up"

"FROM his neck down a man is worth about \$1.50 a day; from his neck up he may be worth \$100,000 a year." The particular significance of this description of a man's earning capacity lies in the fact that it was given by a prominent business man who began his career in life minus both legs, his left arm and the fingers of his right hand. Such were the conditions that led to the success of Michael J. Dowling, president of the State Bank of Olivia, Minn. His accident, as the *Hospital School Journal* narrates it, was the result of a fierce Minnesota blizzard in which he was caught thirty-five years ago. He absolutely refused to become a public charge and decided that he must acquire an education. Arrangement was made for his attendance at school, and after a successful course of studies he began his life of usefulness as a teacher in a country school.

But a country school wasn't big enough to hold Dowling very long and he went into business. From that day he climbed steadily. He married; one of his daughters is in college, and the other two are preparing to follow her. His political career, which made him speaker of the Minnesota House of Representatives, established him as a man of affairs in his community, and he is so looked upon today.

Mr. Dowling never thinks of himself as a cripple because he isn't one. He laughs at you when you mention the word. He drives his car, rides horseback, and enjoys life with the enthusiasm of a boy. It is natural that the success of the handicapped man should be close to his heart; and it has been always. But when the war came to America, Mr. Dowling's desire to serve his country was quickened, and he offered himself for any work among the wounded that might bring cheer and sound practical advice.

There are no illusions in his mind as to the re-education of the soldier and sailor. He has deep confidence in the power of American medicine and surgery and in the teaching brains of the country that will be brought into play. What he emphasizes as the greatest need in his country today is common-sense—"horse-sense" he calls it—toward the handicapped man. Sentiment, yes; but intelligent sentiment that will kindle a man's ambition, not quench it.

Viewing the picture of the man as he stands poised at ease upon his artificial limbs no one could for a moment suspect that what he beheld was little more than the trunk of a man, while all else was the result of surgery, mechanism, art and human perseverance. But it is the heart and brain that count, and the dauntless spirit of the immortal soul informing them. Here is a fine lesson of courage for maimed and sound alike.

The National Religion of Japan

WHILE the doctrine of the Divine rights of kings, introduced by the Reformation, is now universally repudiated throughout Europe, a halo of celestial light still surrounds the "Imperial Dynasty of Japan." "The great divinity Amaterasu," writes Ono Tokouzan in the *Jidai Shico*, Japan's most intellectual magazine, "is at once the ancestor of the Imperial House and of the Japanese people, a mysterious personage, a type of exalted wisdom and eminent virtue, the sun which enlightens the earth, the manifestation of the great soul of the universe." The veiled nature-cult, thus cherished among the learned as a national and patriotic tradition, and jealously preserved by them, is early instilled into the minds of the children in the primary schools. The following example from one of the text-books used in the Japanese schools is given in the *Japan Chronicle*:

His Majesty, the Emperor's first ancestor, was the great Goddess of Celestial Light. Like the rays of the sun, his dignity reaches to the highest summits of sublimity and to the furthestmost limits of universality. Our Empire of Japan is that which in the beginning the great goddess placed under the governance of her grandson, Ninigi-no-mikoto. When she deigned to descend upon it she said: "This earth is the empire which I give to my Imperial Posterity. Go then and govern it. Thy reign shall be a glorious one, and shall have no bounds but those of the heavens and the earth." Thus deigned she to speak; and if our Empire has not been shaken for 10,000 generations, it is, without gainsaying, by virtue of the ancient promise.

An idolatrous-nature worship, skilfully interwoven with a popular ancestor-cult, both cunningly blended with the natural aspirations of the Japanese people, is the obstacle that Christianity will have to overcome in the conversion of this small but aggressive nation that has assumed the unquestioned leadership of the Eastern world. In Japan, as elsewhere, a primary object of the Catholic Church must at present be to convince the people that no doctrines can better promote loyalty, patriotism and all the virtues that make for true national excellence and greatness, than those which Christ commissioned her teach. Vast is the field and golden the opportunity for missionary enterprise that now present themselves in the Far East.

Canada's Jesuit Missionaries

IN his recent book, "Crusaders of New France," Mr. William Bennett Munro, pays the following tribute to that country's Jesuit missionaries:

The Jesuits sailed for Canada, and their arrival forms a notable landmark in the history of the colony. Their dogged zeal and iron persistence carried them to points which missionaries of no other Religious Order would have reached. For the Jesuits were, above all things else, the harbingers of a militant faith. Their organization and their methods admirably fitted them to be the pioneers of the Cross in new lands. They were men of action, seeking to win their crown of glory and their reward through intense physical and spiritual exertions, not through long seasons of prayer and meditation in cloistered seclusion. Loyola, the founder of the Order, gave to the world the nucleus of a crusading host, disciplined as no army ever was. If the Jesuits could not achieve the spiritual conquest of the New World, it was certain that no others could. And this conquest they did achieve. The whole course of Catholic missionary effort throughout the Western Hemisphere was shaped by members of the Jesuit Order.

The physical vigor, the moral heroism, and the unquenchable religious zeal of these missionaries were qualities exemplified in a measure and to a degree which are beyond the power of any pen to describe. Historians of all creeds have tendered homage to their self-sacrifice and zeal, and never has work of human hand or spirit been more worthy of tribute. The Jesuit went, often alone, where no others dared to go, and he faced unknown dangers which had all the possibilities of torture and martyrdom. Nor did this energy waste itself in flashes of isolated triumph. The Jesuit was a member of an efficient organization, skilfully guided by inspired leaders and carrying its extensive work of Christianization with machine-like thoroughness through the vastness of five continents. We are too apt to think only of the individual missionary's glowing spirit and rugged faith, his picturesque strivings against great odds, and to regard him as a guerilla warrior against the hosts of darkness. Had he been this, and nothing more, his efforts must have been altogether in vain. The great service which the Jesuit missionary rendered in the New World, both to his country and to his creed, were due not less to the matchless organization of the Order to which he belonged than to qualities of courage, patience, and fortitude which he himself showed as a missionary.

After describing the Fathers' increasing efforts to suppress the brandy-traffic which the seventeenth-century *coureurs-de-bois* carried on with the aborigines, Mr. Munro remarks: "They [the Jesuits] were, when all is said and done, the truest friends that the North American Indian has ever had."